00111597

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

The Church and the World.

BY THE SAME EDITOR.

Printed uniformly, and bound in limp cloth, with red edges,

Price 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

Second Edition.

Lyra Messianica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

Second Edition.

Lyra Eucharistica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Lately Published.

Lyra Mystica:

HYMNS AND VERSES ON SACRED SUBJECTS.

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

111597
QC

BY VARIOUS WRITERS.

B 1343

EDITED BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

London:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.
1866.

[*All rights reserved.*]

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

00111597

Preface.

THE several Authors of the following Essays are responsible only for the statements contained in their own contributions.

The Essays have been written independently of one another; and, in the treatment of their subjects, the Writers have been left free to express their individual convictions. This freedom from Editorial interference, whilst it allows occasional variations to be perceived on questions of opinion, brings into high relief the evidence of essential harmony amongst the Contributors in matters of Faith and Principle—such substantial unity, with diversity in detail, marking all the more plainly the pervading influence of a common Creed.

Two of the Essays are anonymous. In the case of one, the reason is obvious. In the case of the other, it was decided that on the neutral ground between the

domains of "Revelation and Science," the position assumed should be lost or won in virtue of the inherent weakness or strength of the arguments employed, independently of any influence arising from the Author's name.

For the authenticity of the "Autobiography," the Editor is, of course, responsible. The proper names in it alone are fictitious. The paper may be viewed as an Essay in the form of a narrative.

This Volume is put forth in the hope that it may serve towards the solution of certain important "Questions of the Day," upon which the Church and the World come in contact.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

Easter, A.D. 1866.

Contents.

NO.		PAGE
1.	University Extension By the Rev. JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, M.A., *Professor of Political Economy in the University of Oxford.*	1
2.	The Missionary Aspect of Ritualism By the Rev. RICHARD FREDERICK LITTLEDALE, M.A., LL.D.	25
3.	Infanticide: its Cause and Cure By the Rev. HENRY HUMBLE, M.A., *Canon of S. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth.*	51
4.	Cathedral Reform By the Rev. MACKENZIE E. C. WALCOTT, B.D., F.R.S.L., *Precentor and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.*	70
5.	On the Revival of Religious Confraternities By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., *Mission Priest, Horbury-Bridge, Wakefield.*	93
6.	Hospital and Workhouse Nursing By ALFRED MEADOWS, M.D.	113
7.	Clerical Celibacy By the Rev. JAMES EDWARD VAUX, M.A., *Assistant Curate, S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square.*	141
8.	Re-union of the Church By the Rev. EDWIN L. BLENKINSOPP, M.A., *Rector of Springthorpe, Gainsborough.*	178
9.	The Last Thirty Years in the Church of England: an Autobiography	215
10.	Positivism By the Rev. I. GREGORY SMITH, M.A., *late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, and Rector of Tedstone Delamere, Herefordshire.*	248

NO. PAGE

11. Revelation and Science: Two Interpreters of the Will of God 269

12. The Conscience Clause 296
By the Rev. GEORGE TREVOR, M.A., *Canon of York.*

13. The Eucharistic Sacrifice 330
By the Rev. P. GOLDSMITH MEDD, M.A., *Fellow and Tutor of University College, and Curate of S. John the Baptist, Oxford.*

14. Vows, and their Relation to Religious Communities . . 360
By the Rev. T. THELLUSSON CARTER, M.A., *Rector of Clewer, Windsor.*

15. The Study of Foreign Gothic Architecture, and its Influence on English Art 397
By GEORGE EDMUND STREET, F.S.A.

16. Science and Prayer 412
By the Rev. MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., *Assistant Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and Chaplain to his Excellency, Lord Napier, K.T.*

17. Reasonable Limits of Lawful Ritualism 446
By the Rev. THOMAS WALTER PERRY, *Assistant Curate of S. Michael and All Angels, Brighton.*

18. The Liturgies of 1549 and 1662, Contrasted and Compared 502
By the EDITOR.

The Church and the World:

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

University Extension.

In discussing the various projects which have been put forward with the purpose of extending the University of Oxford, so that it may more fully aid the work and the wants of the English Church, several positions must be taken for granted. It is better to state these, not because they exhaust all the facts which could be very properly alleged in explanation of the causes which have brought about the dearth of graduate candidates for ordination, but in order to save time and obviate some objections. The writer, having by this time lived nearly a quarter of a century in Oxford, and having seen many great and important changes in the constitution and work of the University, is led to the conclusions which he entertains by the experience which his private and public duties in Oxford have enabled him to acquire.

There is one position in which, he apprehends, all are agreed. It is, that it would be a mischievous change if the bulk of the English clergy were hereafter destitute of academical training. It may be that many of the clergy have but an imperfect acquaintance with the real powers which they possess, and are scantily informed of the best means by which these powers could be exercised. But it is certain that, whatever be the deficiencies rightly or wrongly

imputed to the policy of the clergy, these deficiences would be still more marked if the mass of this body was taken from what is called the "literate" class. There has been, and perhaps always will be, a strong necessity for the existence of such establishments as those of Lampeter, S. Aidan's, and S. Bees. It is very possible, that the deficiencies which have been commented on, in the educational acquirements of candidates for ordination trained at these seminaries, may have been exceptional or exaggerated. It is certain that many persons who have received their training at these places have been exceedingly useful and exemplary clergymen. But no one would ever believe that the existence of these colleges has any defence beyond that of necessity, or that, were it possible to supply a true academical education at one of the old Universities to the persons who now pass through a course of study in these subordinate establishments, it would not be a great gain to the candidate for ordination, and to the Church in which he is commissioned to labour.

Again—though here opinion is more divided—it may be allowed that theological colleges, in the strict sense in which the words have been used, are of great benefit to the persons who study in them, and to the Church which secures the service of such training. It has been held, indeed, that the theological college tends to the creation of a type of clergymen whose practice is apt to be narrow and warped. The charge may not be true; but it is certain that it would be too true, if the greater part of those who issued from these seminaries had no other collegiate training, than that which they obtained within the walls of such colleges. As an addition to a previous academical course, as a retreat at once for sober thought upon the grave duties and responsibilities of the Christian ministry, and as a means for supplying theological learning in greater fulness than is, or perhaps could be, given in the older Universities, these colleges have their value, and warrant the affectionate memory with which most of those who have had special instruction at them look back upon the sources of their clerical education.

In the next place, it may be taken for granted that, exceptions considered and accounted for, the majority of those who enter into Holy Orders will expect that "they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." There always are, and we may hope always will be, a number of earnest men who are willing to throw themselves into the Christian ministry without thought or anxiety as to the material consequences to themselves. But, in the first place, such men are comparatively rare, and would, we may be

sure, demand, unconsciously perhaps, but still certainly, a larger measure of freedom in their acts and relations to the Established Church than the custom and rules of the Establishment allow. A man may sacrifice his fortune, or his time, or his independence; but he will very rarely sacrifice all. And we may confidently assert, that there is no Christian people which demands and exacts so much from its clergy, and accords them so little by way of compensation, as the English nation does. Within the last twenty or thirty years, the social position of the clergy has certainly been depreciated, and their material prospects have been considerably lessened.

By far the largest part of those ecclesiastical revenues, the amount of which has been so absurdly exaggerated, are private property, bought and sold as freely as land or stocks. Much of the patronage possessed fifty years ago by the great landowners, and dispensed by them with more or less judgment, has been sold. As part of a great man's estate, to be used by himself, it had little value; but its market price was considerable, and it has been turned into cash. The law, too, has applied the same rigorous protection to this kind of property which it gives to all other kinds, despite its public and responsible character; and a Bishop must be very bold, and very rich, who declines to induct the nominee of any patron, however incompetent he may know the person to be. But, on the other hand, while it fences the beneficed clergyman and his patron by every kind of protection, it leaves, perhaps necessarily, the unbeneficed clergyman entirely at the mercy of the Bishop. How capricious and wayward that personage may be, in the eyes of his unendowed clergy at least, might be illustrated by many examples. And though a portion of the religious public may sometimes applaud episcopal vigour, and endorse episcopal censures—and the censure which can be exercised is the more vigorous the more it is limited in other directions—yet, it must be remembered, that they who give all, may demand some liberty of action in return; and that they who have not as yet pledged themselves, may be deterred from the offering by seeing that, while the sacrifice is complete, the recompense is very deficient, and that while there is great licence for the one class of clergymen, there is no liberty for another. While the prospects and profits of every other profession have improved, those of the clerical office have been depreciated; and it is idle to imagine that, however earnest and faithful a man may be in the discharge of his public duties, he will be wholly uninfluenced by ordinary human motives.

Again, there is an economical rule, to which there is indeed no

exception, that the market value of any object is due to the cost at which it is produced, be it labour or the products of labour. The greater the charge at which a professional person is put, in obtaining the power of exercising his calling, the higher is his rate of remuneration. If agricultural labour were prohibited by law or custom till the labourer were sixteen years old, the wages of this labour would be increased proportionately. A successful barrister is paid at a great rate because he must, as a rule, reach middle life before he attains success at all; and all the charges to which he has been put, for subsistence and education, to the time of his success in his profession, form, so to speak, the capital stock on which he expects and procures professional payment. To be more accurate, the rate at which he is paid is relative to all the charges and risks which attend on all who embark in his profession, just as the value of a diamond is not relative to the actual labour only of the person who finds it, but of all the labour which must be expended before another diamond of equal size can be procured. And if the rate of remuneration for the service rendered falls below a fair compensation for the labour and work employed in providing the service, the supply will inevitably diminish. In just the same manner the supply of candidates for Orders, on the presumption that these persons are, as a rule, actuated in great degree by ordinary human motives, will be relative to the material prospects actually before them—that is, to the supply of such remuneration as they may reasonably expect will fall to their share in the distribution of ecclesiastical endowments or income. And, by way of illustration, the great sale of the Chancellor's livings, capriciously as the patronage had been ordinarily exercised, was, *pro tanto*, a diminution of the motives which might aid in inducing persons to enter into Holy Orders, because it alienated another part of that which previously lay within the reasonable prospect of an unbeneficed clergyman. With less to hope for and more work to do, with the knowledge that other professional avocations are better paid, and perhaps as much esteemed socially, and that the clerical office is more scantily compensated and is gradually occupying an inferior social status, it is no wonder that men hesitate before they enter on Holy Orders. It is altogether unreasonable to expect the devotion of an Apostle from an unbeneficed clergyman, and to reward him with less wages and less liberty than a domestic servant. And it will be remembered that the deficiency in the supply of candidates for Holy Orders is not a deficiency of persons ordained to hold family livings, who are, of course, just as numerous as ever, or indeed more numerous,

as more livings are appropriated to such ends; but of persons to work as curates, with no other than ordinary professional prospects.

As has been said, the supply of candidates for any occupation is relative to the cost of producing the labour, and the rate at which the labour when produced is remunerated. But the cost of producing most professional labour is diminished. The tax on attorney's certificates has been reduced, and the time of apprenticeship shortened. The same facts apply to the profession of a barrister. A general practitioner in medicine may, perhaps, be subject to a more searching examination; but the formal curriculum is shortened. On the other hand, the cost of producing clerical labour has increased, actually as well as relatively, for the general charges of an academical education are higher, and the endowments in aid of education have been transferred to the general public, in place of being limited, as they were in practice before the University Reform Acts, to the clergy and their sons.

The real reason that the clergy are so poorly paid in most European countries, says Adam Smith, lies in the fact that they are entirely, or almost entirely, educated at the public charge out of academical or ecclesiastical endowments. And, conversely, the interpretation of the social phenomenon given by the great economist, will explain why it is that, the remuneration of the clergy remaining the same, the supply of candidates is deficient. They are no longer educated at the public expense—that is, they are no longer the sole recipients of academical endowments. This change is so striking that it is important to comment on the facts.

For some time before the Act of 1859, the practice had begun of selecting candidates for junior academical endowments on the sole ground of scholarship, without considering any superior claim on the ground of poverty. It may be, that the change was an unconscious one, or that it may have originated in the fact that at one college, in which the custom seems to have commenced, the reputation achieved by obtaining a scholarship was so considerable, as to make the possession of this distinction an object of ambition to young men whose fortunes, or the fortunes of whose parents, put them far above the necessity of any such aid. In other words, a real revolution was taking place in the tenure of these endowments; and a college scholarship was being made an honour, instead of being, as was always intended in its foundation, an aid. The word "college-scholarship" is used advisedly, for University scholarships and prizes, with one exception—the

Craven—were all of modern foundation, and were always intended to be honours.

The change preceded the writer's experience. It is probable that a colour was given to the innovation by the practice of certain societies which had, in utter defiance of oaths and statutes, elected wealthy persons, and the sons of wealthy persons, to fellowships. This was particularly the case with Merton and All Souls. The senior fellow of Merton College for many years was a general officer, and another of the fellows was reputed to be a partner in a well-known firm engaged in the manufacture of gunpowder. The senior fellow of All Souls was an eminent member of the diplomatic corps, and other fellows were in analogous positions. The irregularity of these proceedings is the more noteworthy when we consider, so stringent was the condition of poverty annexed to the All Souls' foundation, that Bishop Fleetwood wrote his *Chronicon Pretiosum*, the sole work which has hitherto been published on mediæval prices, in order to satisfy the conscience of a fellow of All Souls, that five pounds a year, which the revised statutes of the college allowed a fellow to hold in addition to his college income, must be interpreted with some latitude three hundred years after the foundation. An attempt indeed was made to distinguish between personal and real estate, as a valid plea for the unlimited possession of the former. Such reasoning would be discreditable to the morality, and inconsistent with the intelligence of the typical Jesuit.

But though some innovation on the ancient practice had been committed in the election to scholarships, and the wholesome rule that a college endowment is no honour, but an aid, had been broken through, the practice was far from general, because the rule had not been formally repealed, and the colleges were at once alive to the obligation imposed on them by their statutes, and had no corporate ambition to consult in the election to those endowments which were designed for the junior members of the University. As a consequence, the scholars of the colleges were the most orderly and economical of the students. Any extravagance on the part of these eleemosynaries was looked on as an offence, which the terms of the young men's academical position did not warrant or justify. And as these scholars were, even under such conditions, just as much the best men, intellectually, in the University as they are now, they had their legitimate influence on the tone and work of the place.

The Act of 1859 completely broke down this ancient *régime*. The framers of the Act, despite strong remonstrance, determined to ignore the condition of poverty, at least in scholarships, and to

throw open the competition absolutely to the best acquirements in such subjects as form the ordinary curriculum of school teaching and scholarship examination. It is quite clear, as from this time forth a scholarship was to be regarded as an honour, that the competition for such a position would be thrown far more into the hands of those who could afford the best school teaching for their sons; in other words, that they who could best do without academical endowments would be most sure to get them.

This is not the place in which to discuss the expediency of this measure, or the difficulty there was in dealing with the subject in any other way, but only to advert to the effect which it produced and is producing upon the resources available for the education of the clergy and the expenditure of University undergraduates. The great feeders of the Church were the clergy. Their sons naturally followed their fathers' occupation. The fathers were at the University; and being generally acquainted with some of the residents in the society to which they had belonged, had the best opportunity of knowing the means which might be available for the education of their children, and the aids which these ancient foundations afforded to schools, localities, and families; for the right of founder's kin, however much it might have been abused, was a solid and intelligible passport to the persons above mentioned. All this, or nearly all this is swept away, and with it a vast mass of the resources which were provided for the training of the clergy.

Again, as the scholarships in the University have now been left for competition to the rich, the motives to economy have been very much weakened. It has been said that the possession of academical income was generally understood to be a bar to extravagant habits, because the recipient of a benefaction was not, by the very terms of his position, justified in any considerable outlay or show. But now, as the endowments of the colleges are becoming increasingly the endowments of the rich, those persons who were once the most economical are now, save some exceptions, the most extravagant.

Much, no doubt, of this increased extravagance, affecting as it does all classes by example, is due to the great decline of academical discipline; much more, the writer is persuaded, to the pernicious folly of what has been called "muscular Christianity," or physical education. To hear some people talk, one would be disposed to infer that, with them at least, the highest and holiest duties of life consist in developing one's muscles, improving one's wind, and perfecting oneself in all sorts of gymnastic exercise. The boat, the cricket club, the foot-ball match, are not only the place or sphere of action in which one is prepared to do the best

one can as a matter of solid sport, but which is to be the passion, the pursuit, the master science of the student. Schoolmasters have been occupied by this absurd affectation; and one hears on all sides that the victories which their pupils acquire in these exercises, wholesome and needful when confined within proper limits, are the true objects of youthful occupation, to which learning and school diligence are, on the whole, subsidiary. Delicate boys are to be provided, we are told, with certificates to the effect that they are not competent to share in these absorbing struggles. At the University, the appliances for such exercises are enormously in demand. Every college has its cricket-ground, its boat-house, and, if things go on in the same course, will possess its racket-court, perhaps its billiard-room. The summer term was shortened, we were gravely informed, because it was absolutely impossible to get any work out of men who were all day long on the cricket-ground or the river.

Assuredly, twenty years ago, before we heard of this overpowering duty to one's physical organization, men were as active and energetic as now. An undergraduate who moped and was solitary in his ways, was looked on with suspicion; and a man who read hard, and exercised himself heartily and healthily, was not only liked, but generally beat those who did not recognize the wisdom of joining physical exertion to mental labour. We have gone back to the Laconian exercises, and perhaps need the same criticism on the practice of our youth which Aristotle uttered on the Spartan institutions—*ὥστε τὸ καλὸν ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ θηριῶδες δεῖ πρωταγωνιστεῖν*—It is the first duty of a teacher to train the moral and intellectual, not the animal part of a youth.

The rise of these practices in the University, and the alteration in its discipline and conduct, has not diminished the number of undergraduates. On the contrary, more persons matriculate than did twenty years ago, though the increase is by no means proportionate to the growth of private wealth and the material prosperity of the nation. But though as many, or even more, enter here, and go through, with more or less rapidity, the course of their study, the classes who make use of the University do not intend to enter the Priesthood, mainly, it may be concluded, because they have not contemplated any such prospects, since they are not derived from those sources which have hitherto supplied candidates for Holy Orders.

Two other reasons are alleged for the diminution of these numbers. One, which no doubt operates to some slight extent, is the fact that, in one direction, a large number of offices is opened to public competition which formerly were confined to

private patronage. The Indian writerships no doubt absorb a certain number of persons who might otherwise have become clergymen; but it is certain that not more than twelve of these are on an average of years elected from the Oxford undergraduates, and that not more than half of those twelve would have entered upon Holy Orders. The loss of six persons a year, from one of the great Universities, would not have produced a perceptible deficiency.

Again it is said, with what accuracy the writer is unable to decide, that the peculiar phase of modern religious controversy, partaking, as it is avowed, of so much debate on the fundamental facts of Christianity, has deterred many men from any active co-operation in the work of the Church. But, as a rule, it is generally the case, that when morality is sound, and persons are not disaffected, the very existence of a material for controversy is highly provocative of combatants. Many, indeed, of the clergy may be disaffected, and, considering their resources and their prospects, it is not wonderful that they are so; but to imagine that they are indifferent to religious belief because that belief has been assailed, is to contravene ordinary experience.

Taking into account, then, the facts which have been alleged, that the material prospects of the clergy are relatively to the general increase of wealth, and absolutely as contained in the hopes they may entertain of a sufficient remuneration for their labours, seriously diminished; that the opportunities for an assisted education at the University are greatly lessened, if they are not indeed all but reft from them; and that the charges of an ordinary unassisted education are largely increased; we have sufficient causes, without taking into account the other incidents which affect or may affect their calling, to account for the diminution in the number of graduate candidates who annually appear before a Bishop that they may enter on the ministry of the Church.

It is to meet this avowed deficiency, that there is a generally unanimous feeling in the University of Oxford. The persons who met in the hall of Oriel College, and whose proceedings, having been reported, are therefore fairly the objects of further discussion, were thoroughly agreed as to the propriety of University extension, as to the duty incumbent on those, who were conscious of the want and capable of suggesting remedies, of doing their best to supply that which was needed, and of the propriety of taking such means in order to add to the number of students avowedly purposing to take Holy Orders, as would not give the class of students either a special or distinct character, or would seclude them from the general education of the place, or

from association with those who would hereafter be occupied in lay business. In a word, it was thought unadvisable, whatever were the forms which the extension took, to establish a purely clerical college. Here, however, the unanimity ended.

The plan which evidently found the greatest favour with the promoters of the meeting, was that of establishing a new college, which should contain at least a hundred rooms, and which, therefore, might be calculated to afford, supposing all the inmates were intended for Holy Orders, about thirty candidates a year. Some of the speakers wished that the funds needful for the purpose should be collected by private subscription; others objected that, as the University had annually a considerable surplus income, and as the funds of the colleges would certainly be vastly increased, beyond the power of distribution among the foundation, in the course of a few years, that it was just and reasonable that a portion of this wealth should be devoted to purely academical uses. One of the speakers, a fellow of Oriel College, and one of the members for the city of Oxford, startled his audience by asserting that the annual sum which would shortly arise from college estates, over and above that which may now or hereafter be divided among the society, was so considerable as to enable these societies collectively to build and endow a new college annually. There is a means of verifying or rebutting this statement, that, namely, of a parliamentary return of the present and prospective income of the colleges, a return which, probably, would not be refused if it were demanded, seeing that, at any rate, since Parliament has virtually determined the amount of each fellow's income, the surplus is a fund over which the nation in Parliament might, in accordance with its position as guardian of all charities, consider itself competent to apply so legitimate an application of the *cy près* doctrine, as to call for the devotion of a portion of these funds to educational purposes within the University. It may be added that the University possesses considerable estates available for public buildings within its precincts, and that it has lately purchased a large site once occupied by the city workhouse, which might easily be employed as a convenient locality for a new college.

This plan contained provisoes that the education should be very cheap, indeed almost gratuitous; that the economy should be rigid and precise; and that, on the whole, the instruction of the undergraduates should be specially committed to the care of the Professors, who should thereupon have a considerable authority in the government of the society. And some of the speakers with great reason alleged, that in all likelihood, provided, of

course, the constitution of this establishment remained unaltered, the discipline and efficiency of the new college would enable the students to compete successfully in academic examinations with the members of older but less perfectly disciplined societies.

At first sight, there are some notable exceptions to be taken to this scheme. To begin, it is very like the act of those who, having turned the rightful owners out of their home, conceive it a duty to build them a new one. Every college, every endowment, was founded on these conditions of discipline, poverty, and economy. The whole machinery of collegiate instruction is modern, the whole of its extravagance is more modern still. And to revive in a single instance the common life of a past age, without enforcing the same conditions on all alike, is to commit an anachronism which is almost certain to be a failure. It may be safely predicted, too, that in the course of time, when the novelty of the college wears off, and the reins of discipline, in the inevitable contrast with other establishments, are relaxed, that the new college will become the property of those social classes who have already evicted the legitimate descendants of former possessors from their inheritance. For it has been found over and over again, that where no positive or social distinction is put between the status of one set of men and another, the stronger—in this case the richer—succeeds in occupying that which was intended for other people. Nothing but the distinctive dress has saved the endowment of Christ's Hospital from being absorbed by the richer classes. If the garb were done away with, very few years would elapse before the revenues of that great charity would become the possession of those who never need and, on the original basis of the charity, could not justly claim them. And in just the same way, supposing the new college were established, however stringent were the rules by which it might be guarded, if it once became an object of convenience, of emulation, of advantage, to get on the roll of such a society, the persons for whom it was intended would have to seek some other machinery, in order to procure their necessary education. The Church, supposing the Establishment remains in its present state, would have either to devise a fresh scheme for the academical education of its candidates, or to accept such persons as now, in increasing numbers, seek admission into its ministry.

No one, however, who advocated the scheme, suggested that any mark or badge should, *ab initio*, beyond that of the knowledge that they were men of narrow means, be put on the inmates of this new society. They did not, moreover, suggest means by which the infection of emulation in the physical part-

of University education should be obviated. Are these members of the new college to be deterred from the customary exercises of the place? Are they not to row in a boat, to join in athletic sports, play cricket, like the rest? Will it be possible, since no police can be exercised upon them, apart from that which ensues from the profession of narrow circumstances, to keep these men at once economical and respected? But supposing the funds were provided, the college built, the education cheap and effective, the students diligent, the discipline permanent, and the supply of candidates for Orders nearly equal to the number of those who reside within the new college (for none of those who advocated this measure were desirous that the tone of the society should be wholly clerical, or the students merely theological), what would be the nature and extent of the supply to the wants of the Christian ministry? So trivial as to be almost nothing. So slight as not to meet the demand in any appreciable degree.

There are, it is said, about twenty-four thousand clergymen of the Established Church. Of these, perhaps, eight thousand are of the class who, even if an academical education were more expensive than it is, would graduate and take Holy Orders, either because they are the sons of persons who are at once patrons and incumbents, or because, being younger sons, or having powerful family connexions, they are tolerably sure of a sufficient provision in Holy Orders. The remaining sixteen thousand come from that kind of class in society which is powerfully affected by the material considerations adverted to above. That is, they are men who, however great their patience and self-denial, however ardent and earnest, are nevertheless influenced, or indirectly influence others in declining to enter on an occupation for which the preparation is now so expensive, in which the blanks are out of all proportion to the prizes, and in which the prizes seem to be given by some inexplicable caprice.

Taking the average duration of human life, at twenty-four years of age, to be twenty years (and this is a very liberal estimate), and that eight hundred such persons must enter upon Holy Orders annually, in order to maintain the number, how slight an addition would be made by the operation of the new college, even if all the students entered into Holy Orders. How unlikely is it that the addition of these thirty would be tantamount to the annual diminution in the number of academical candidates which have till late years presented themselves. The changes in the Universities have lost to the Church candidates by hundreds: the new college would replace them by tens; and it

would not be in operation for three years before the claim for a fresh supply would be equally urgent.

There are other points in connexion with such a scheme which no doubt might present themselves, when the question is viewed practically. If Mr. Neate's proposal, that the proposed college be endowed out of the surplus funds of the University and existing colleges were accepted, would a charter be granted to a society to be created out of funds which other men—very wrong-headed perhaps, but very positive and very powerful—conceive to be secular in their character, and only religious by reason of the fact that men educated by them voluntarily resolve on becoming ecclesiastics? No objection, it is probable, would be made to contributions for the sake of establishing a college for persons who, as a rule, intended to take Orders; but it may be doubted whether there be not at present a growing conviction that lay persons are as much interested in the distribution of academical revenues as the clergy have been. It is certain, that the claims of the laity to a permanent association in the benefit of academical endowments have been successfully vindicated, and are likely to be increasingly asserted. And if this temper grows, it may be, even if the proposed society be created out of existing funds, that it will not long retain its specific, its avowed, though not its sole purpose.

Again, what guarantee will be found for the effectual working of an establishment which must rely, as far as has hitherto been stated, on the conscientious labour of its founders, and of those who, for the Church's sake, will take a continuous and lasting interest in its prosperity? Let us attempt to answer the question by an analogous case. There is a body of statutes which the Vice-Chancellor is bound to administer, affecting the halls. These statutes, probably a little antiquated—certainly needing, on the most cursory inspection, reconsideration—are entirely fallen into desuetude. A member myself of one of these halls, I have never heard a single instance of any appeal to the Vice-Chancellor; nor of any voluntary interference on his part with the regimen of these establishments; nor of any inspection; nor indeed of any act implying the least control over them—except when, for legal purposes only, he, as the permanent trustee of such funds as they possess, is asked to sanction the transfer of property, or the alteration of trusts held for the benefit of such societies. It would be ridiculous to imagine that no occasion has arisen on which such an interference might not have been very properly invoked. If with a body of statutes affecting existing academical societies, no action is taken, what pledge will or can be given

that, however stringent be the conditions by which this new arrangement is affected, any of these conditions will be practically operative? There is very great reason to believe that only a few years would elapse; (changes of thought and habit being particularly rapid in a society which, like the University, is continually affected by the departure of the majority of its collegiate staff, and which in course of time will be liable to more frequent mutations;) and however strict have been the conditions under which the new college will be constituted, inevitable laxity and negligence will modify them.

It has been often urged, that a more conscientious economy should be carried out in the existing colleges; that the present habit of expenditure should be arrested; that, if need be, powers should be obtained to fulfil certain manifest duties more rigidly; or even, distasteful as it may seem to some, that the income of these endowments, entrusted in the first instance to discover and sustain natural ability and diligence in every condition of life, but which are now in the course of being bestowed on the rich, should be restored to the ancient possessors. It is indeed argued, that to attempt a recovery of earlier discipline is impracticable; that the step once taken is irretrievable; that to strive after the restoration of academical endowments to those persons and those objects for whom they were originally destined, is to revive the Heptarchy; that the principles of the Act of 1859 cannot be reconsidered; and that among these principles one of the most obvious and absolute, is that which declares that all academical endowments are to be bestowed on scholastic acquirements, without any condition whatever annexed to them. It may be that an Act of Parliament is an act of irretrievable wisdom, and that a public question once debated, must be taken as finally settled. But such a rule will not encourage persons to subscribe voluntarily to a new college; and, as has been stated before, the application of existing or contingent funds from the superfluous income of the present foundations, will be assuredly liable to the control of another rule, not a whit less stringent than that which regulates the condition on which endowments may be enjoyed, that namely, which considers all excess of corporate income as liable to Parliamentary control and guidance.

It is suggested again, that additions should be made to existing colleges. There is nothing to prevent such colleges as have space available for the purpose from adopting the suggestion, without the intervention of a committee, or the benefit of a debate, unless, indeed, which can hardly be imagined, the colleges which desire to expand themselves have a design on the

surplus income of the University, or the other academical corporations. Colleges have borrowing powers, could mortgage estates, and can, to judge from ordinary experience, obtain such a profit on rooms available for undergraduates, as would suffice to meet the interest of loans, to form a fund for the gradual liquidation of debt, and to leave besides a handsome income for those persons whom they may think proper to put into college offices. It must be remembered, however, that only a few colleges have the power of expansion. Most of those which lie within the compass of the old city walls, could not enlarge themselves, having already occupied all their available space.

But, in reality, an enlargement of existing colleges would not, even in the most trivial degree, meet the difficulty of the present crisis. It might, to be sure, augment the income of the head and the fellows, in case they had not reached the maximum at which their stipends are fixed; and would, beyond question, enlarge the resources of the college tutors. But it would not necessarily add a single graduate candidate to the diminishing number of those who now offer themselves for Holy Orders, because what is wanted for these persons is a cheap and effective education; whereas that now supplied by the colleges, however effective it may be, is certainly dear.

A similar objection applies to the proposal made by one head of a college, that residence within the walls should be dispensed with after two years. This change would certainly allow existing colleges to take an increased number of undergraduates, but it would by no means guarantee a cheap education. Residence in lodgings, *after a young man has lived in college*, is, on the whole, dearer than residence in college. Every expense belonging to his college life remains the same, with this addition—that while he is generally exempt from paying rent (never exceedingly high for unfurnished rooms), he has to take furnished lodgings in some of the chief streets, with all the contingent costs of such an arrangement, and all the risks, neither rare nor remote, of being the victim of perpetual overcharges and pilferings. There cannot, it seems, be a doubt, that if the present residence in rooms costs him 200*l.* to 250*l.* a year, living in lodgings for the last year would add another 50*l.* to the charges of education; and thus, although the plan might add to the number of undergraduates, and increase the income of college officers, it would not be at all likely to meet the real question before the University—the propriety of taking such steps as would secure a cheap education for those who purpose entering into Orders in the English Church.

None of those who spoke on the subject of University extension desired that the benefits which the adoption of any scheme implied, should be confined to those students only who designed to take Holy Orders. The evils of what we may call a sectional college are so manifest and so considerable, that no one would willingly, except under the purest necessity, accept or support a scheme which should be founded upon an exclusively clerical basis. And though the primary purpose of the action taken by the University, and the formation of a Committee to consider and report on the means for furthering this purpose, was immediately relative to the supply of clergymen; yet, there was nothing, it appears, irregular in the suggestion of Dr. Acland, that the action taken should include the question whether the contemplated expansion of the University might not be rendered available for the general education of medical men and attorneys.

This paper, relating as it does only to the question of University extension for the sake of the Church, would go rather out of its course if it contained any comment on the real or supposed deficiencies of medical or legal education. But, that it would be highly desirable on public grounds, that persons whose future career is to be that which is popularly called professional, should be, if possible, educated together, is, we may believe, in the fullest degree admitted by all who have made even the most superficial inquiry into the social relations of all such persons. Perhaps one of the greatest difficulties which lies in the way of many a clergyman, is that which arises from the fact that his education has completely dissociated him from many among the most intelligent of those with whom he comes in contact in the course of his ministrations.

There are yet two other plans, both of which are supported by very high authority, and both of which perhaps might be adopted simultaneously; nor is their adoption inconsistent with the foundation of the new college. On the contrary, both are experiments which might be made, without committing the University to more than a trial; and both, it may be believed, would operate as energetic stimulants to the present and far from effective collegiate system. These are, first, the scheme of suffering persons to reside in the town, of course under certain restrictions and guarantees, as members of the University, without belonging to any existing college or hall; secondly, that of affiliation, also under well-defined and intelligible conditions.

The plea that the University might well be expanded by suffering residence in Oxford under such conditions as might be conceived sufficient for purposes of police and supervision, is no

new one. It was, beyond doubt, the ancient habit of the University, and continued in vogue down to the Reformation, very few of the colleges having had any members within their walls, other than such as were upon the foundation. So general was this rule, that even the Founder's kin boys, as they were called, at Merton College, whom the society was bound to maintain and educate, were lodged without the walls of the college, in a separate building; and though, perhaps, on some occasions, the scion of a royal or noble house was admitted into the college—as it was said that Henry the Fifth was in his youth, at Queen's—the practice was exceedingly rare, and is always mentioned as exceptional. The original buildings, indeed, of no college contemplated the admission of independent students. These persons always lodged in the town, generally in halls, which were hired for their use, and the cost of which was guaranteed by the Principal, whom the students invariably elected to govern the society. It cannot be doubted, however, that many lived in private lodgings, subject to no other control than the general authority of the University officials. And though, since the Laudian statutes, the rule has prevailed, that all members of the University should also be found on the books of some college or hall, it is only, as the writer has been informed by one of the oldest members of the University, within the present century that the obligation of three years' residence within the walls of one of these establishments has been exacted or enforced.

This plan has been advocated in later times. It is to be found among the innumerable suggestions contained in the report of the Oxford University Commission. It was recommended as the only means by which the University could be expanded within its own precincts so as to meet the wants of the time, and in particular the needs of the Church, in a work written five years ago by the author of this paper, and entitled, "Education in Oxford." (*Smith & Elder.*) It has been urged anew upon the University by Dr. Temple, the present head master of Rugby, who, twelve or thirteen years ago, took strong objection to the scheme, but has now signified his adherence to it.

The chief objections alleged against the plan, are the loss of the social influences which the mutual intercourse of young men supplies, and which are justly held to be among the most valuable among the results of academical training; and the contingency of a lax discipline and a lax morality, as consequent upon the unrestrained residence of young men in a large town.

The first of these difficulties is undoubtedly the gravest. The association of young men with each other, is the cause of many

among the benefits which are traceable to academical training. It is not, of course, peculiar to a University course. Shy and timid children are turned, in a similar way, into modest and courageous schoolboys. Rough and ill-mannered lads get a lesson of the same character in the social discipline of the army, when the tone of a regimental mess is healthy. To lose any part of the benefit of the association with other men of one's own age, pursuits, habits, is a loss which nothing can countervail. But in the present case, and till a considerable change takes place in the ordinary life of the undergraduate members of the University, the question is not—what is the best way in which this new element in the University can be trained, but—what is best and cheapest. If it be not possible to avail oneself of the fullest advantages of academical training, which is the best means by which we can obtain the largest measure of advantage to those whose circumstances absolutely debar the use of the ordinary course of University life?

Though, however, we may admit that the student who lives in lodgings, disconnected from any regular society of other young men, cannot but lose some social advantages, it may be doubted whether we who live habitually in Oxford, do not underrate the influence of local associations, and ignore the University in the colleges. Till within the last ten or fifteen years, there were very few persons who, being members of the colleges, resided in the University precincts in private houses. Since, however, the changes which have turned the professorial element in the University from a mere ornamental appendance into an increasing reality, a great number of persons have taken up their residence in Oxford. As most of these persons have a permanent interest and permanent duties in the place, it cannot fail but that ultimately much of the conduct of the University will lie in their hands. Year by year, the College Tutors are more rapidly moving away. Younger men take college offices, younger men take college livings, fewer fellows reside in the University. It is unreasonable to suppose that in a few years' time, all authority and influence in the University will be occupied, as it hitherto has been, by the tutorial staff, composed as it will mainly be, of the junior Masters of Arts. But every thing which gives strength to the University, and enables its officers to fulfil functions which lie without the action of the colleges, supplies a fuller mechanism for instruction and discipline, and withal for many among the advantages of an academical course, in the case of those who might be introduced to the University under the scheme of Dr. Temple and others.

The colleges have, no doubt, become the University. But it now appears, that there are wants which the colleges cannot supply; further needs, which the University can satisfy. To provide the means for such a demand as is made upon the University, is in reality to revive its ancient character, and to make it that which tradition stamps it to have been—one of the great centres of national education. It is true that much of the material which was once introduced into this place, is now instructed elsewhere; but, on the other hand, the professional classes are far more numerous than ever, and as the active life of most persons who are engaged in such occupations commences, as a rule, at the same time as it does with those who enter into Holy Orders, there seems no reason to doubt that, were the benefits of a University education at a cheap rate offered to such persons, there would be an enormous influx of students to the University. The colleges are, in short, the great and expensive public schools, frequented more and more by the wealthier classes. But the University ought to be, and might be, the centre to which a great mass of other bodies might be annexed, and by which the benefits of the best teaching could be secured to the largest number of persons.

The other objection to the scheme, is the risk that efficient discipline will not be maintained over such students as live in private houses; that there are and will be serious temptations thrown in the way of personal morality; and that the supervision exercised over young men, now, it is presumed, exercised by college authorities, will be wholly lost. This last point, among others, has been insisted on by Mr. Meyrick, sometime tutor of Trinity College. It cannot be discussed without offence; and though such a line of argument was no doubt far from being Mr. Meyrick's purpose, it is hardly fair to insist upon that in a controversy, the denial of which might be felt to be almost libellous. If college tutors do exercise this wholesome influence over the young men committed to their charge, we may regret the loss which would ensue to those who could not, on the acceptance of Dr. Temple's plan, avail themselves of such superintendence; and can only hope that the University may be able to devise means, whereby some inquiry may be made into the pursuits and conduct of the persons who will live in the town, in case the plan were adopted. The objection is not fatal; for it is certain that by a judicious system of registration, carried out under the management and control of some among the senior residents, much, perhaps all, of the advantages claimed to follow from the advice and exhortations of college tutors may be

attained. Mr. Meyrick does not, probably, recollect by how much younger, as a rule, college tutors are, than they were in his time.

Primâ facie, the risk which such students would run from personal immorality, is far more near. It is a subject which must be adverted to, however unpleasant it be to treat of it. It is supposed that great danger would come from female servants in lodging houses. As most undergraduates, however, reside for some time in lodgings at present, the evil, if it would prevail, must to some extent prevail now. But there is little doubt that the alarm is all but visionary; and that the practical experience of those who have an opportunty of knowing the facts, is competent to outweigh a thousand surmises. The writer of this paper had, for nearly seven years, the charge of the largest rural parish in the neighbourhood of Oxford. There is nothing of which a parish clergyman, among the scandals which reach him, hears more early than he does of the misconduct of any young woman in his parish. The cases, however, which came before the writer's notice, in a parish which supplies more female servants in Oxford than any three in the neighbourhood, were very rare; and in every case the seducer was either the lodging-house keeper, or some person of no very much higher social condition than the woman. Apart from higher motives, which we may suppose are operative to some extent at least, the risk, the degradation, and the scandal, if the offence be detected, are powerful preservatives against incontinence of this kind among undergraduates.

Beyond this, the University has considerable powers of police. There cannot be, it may be safely presumed, when the matter is one which affects the general well-being of the community so strongly, any reasonable doubt—if the existing machinery were inoperative or insufficient to meet the wants of a University, which for purely public purposes designed a scheme by which a far larger number of persons would be invited to take advantage of the benefits of academical education—that parliament would sanction all possible means for the preservation of order and decorum. But, in fact, it is all but certain, that the machinery and the *morale* of the University would be abundantly sufficient to obviate such risks as those which have been, it seems, too confidently foretold; at any rate, to prevent any increase in the risk.

That there are some real inconveniences in the plan, it may be repeated, is not denied. But the question is not, what is the best plan, but which is the most available under the pressure

of a severe demand and a diminishing supply. The want is urgent, immediate, and, by the operation of purely economical causes, will, in all likelihood, unless some speedy remedy be applied, completely alter the character of the material which will be forthcoming for the offices of the Anglican Church.

There is a further plan, which also is deserving of careful attention. It has been suggested by many persons before, and is now supported by an active and very earnest body of men—it is that of affiliation. It is proposed—since certain changes have been made in the course of studies carried out in Oxford, and the necessary standard of classical education can now be attained at an earlier period of a young man's academical career, after which he can devote himself to some special course of study—that, under certain limitations, it should be allowed that certain places of education be permitted to affiliate themselves on the University; that certain parts of the examinations should be passed without the benefit of residence; that, perhaps, the degree of Bachelor of Arts should be open to such students; but that residence in Oxford, equal in amount to that which is now passed, should be exacted from all who are admitted to the degree of Master. In this way a cheap education may be attained; and a certificate of fitness, in the fact that such persons had passed the ordinary examinations at Oxford, would at least put an end to some of those scandals which, according to common report, attend the examination of literates before Bishops.

This scheme is, plainly, even a wider departure from the ancient conditions of academical study, than any plan which has been elsewhere proposed. It suggests that persons might study, be examined, and ultimately attain a particular status in the University, without ever having been near it, except at the periodical examinations. It would, indeed, affiliate only under conditions of a very decided character. It might, for instance, be demanded by the promoters of the scheme, that the affiliated college, or place of education, should be sanctioned by a formal and sufficient charter; that the University should be fully represented in the governing body of the college, and should have an emphatic voice in directing the studies carried on in such affiliated societies; and that the maintenance of the connexion between the University and the society should be always subject to the judgment of the former. It would leave the prospect of election to academical emoluments open to such students as were thus affiliated; but it would insist that, once such students elected to such emoluments, they must forthwith reside in the University.

Such a plan would have these advantages. It would, in the

first place, carry out that ancient purpose of the University, the discovery, namely, of diligent capacity, from a wider field than the machinery already existing is able to cover. It cannot be doubted that many persons are now lost to services of great social value, because no means exist by which they can be found and employed. It would also do much to sustain institutions of great significance, which, vigorous and useful already, might have a power given to them for good of the largest and most effectual kind.

Take, for instance, a place like King's College, in London. Originally instituted to act as a counterpoise to what was believed to be the purely secular system of University College, it is at the present time really doing the work of a University. Its students are not much fewer in the aggregate than those who receive instruction at Oxford. Apart from the education given, which cannot of course, under the circumstances, be of the highest order, the system of evening classes offers, to a number of young men peculiarly open to risks and temptations, advantages of the greatest moral value. The recognition of such a society by the University, after the long and patient way in which it has attained its present utility, would be at once a well-deserved recompense, and an act, it may be said, of great forethought and wise generosity, and withal, a real and effectual aid to some of the best work of the Church. We should not, indeed, recommend that the students of this, or any other place which might be similarly affiliated, should be admitted by the mere fact of examination to academical privileges; and the regulation that residence should be insisted on before the degree of Master of Arts is conferred, must be looked on as an inalienable condition; but it cannot be doubted, that the utility of the work which has been hitherto effected by this institution will be greatly enhanced, and the Church would share in the benefit conferred on one of its most valuable seminaries.

But, whatever be the means adopted, all persons who have given any thought to the subject, and feel any interest in the maintenance of that learning which has hitherto distinguished the Anglican clergy, are agreed that, unless some speedy means are adopted, the social and intellectual reputation of the Christian ministry in England is likely to be seriously endangered. Hitherto, the English clergy have been the most learned in the world; and even now, we may with just pride assert, that there is no department of human knowledge or human thought to which they are not, as heretofore, making great contributions.

The peculiar political position occupied by the Establishment

in this country, justifies at least the claim which its members, lay as well as clerical, may make to some consideration from the present administrators of academical education. Rightly or wrongly, the State holds the Church in a tight grasp. It is not the business of the writer to inquire whether on the whole the bargain is to the advantage of either, or whether all the advantages of the union do not lie on one side. But no one can doubt that the liberty of the clergy, perhaps that of such lay persons as really belong to the Anglican Communion, is seriously impaired by the relations in which that Communion stands to the State. To the Anglican hierarchy, and to those who are in hereditary possession of the greater part of ecclesiastical property, the convenience of the union is absolute and manifest. To the unbeneficed clergy, and to those who have no ground for hoping that they may achieve the independence of a fixed income, the advantages, though more dubious, may still be real. But it would be idle to doubt, that the security which is possessed by the higher and the wealthier clergy, is for the most part bought by the energetic devotion of those who are content to labour with little hope and less encouragement. In an age like our own, which deals with utilities, it cannot be questioned that while the grand height of the ecclesiastical pyramid is respected, the real strength is understood to lie in the solid work at the bottom. To be indifferent to the quality of that material which makes up the rank and file of the clerical army, is to invite contempt and justify degradation. If hereafter the mass of the clergy becomes illiterate and incapable, the most valuable defences on which the hierarchy must rely for its permanence will certainly fall. It may be doubted whether the outworks have not already been weakened.

The time has passed away, perhaps never to be recalled, in which the endowments given to the ancient Universities were the machinery for discovering and promoting capacity. No body of College electors is, or ever will be, able to discover, in the examination of boys just fresh from school, whether what they know suggests their future power for acquiring knowledge of a fuller and more important kind. The material of the University is now in great measure, so to speak, half manufactured; whereas, in old times, it was often well-nigh raw. It cannot be doubted, that much which might be of great service in Letters and to the Church is lost to both, by the fact that, at present, the entrance to the endowments of the University is open only to sixth-form boys in good or actively managed grammar schools.

After the change which has affected her material interests, the Church has a right to demand of the University, on the plea of the

social importance contained in her ministrations—to assert no higher ground, as in the facts that the greater part of its endowments come from the savings of ecclesiastics, and that the most distinguished men in its *fasti* have, with few exceptions, been of the same order—that in these later days her need for an increased supply of educated clergy should be met by some relaxation in the charge at present incurred in the process of graduation. All the plans which have been suggested seem, to the writer, to have their advantages, and to be capable of simultaneous adoption; though none seem so likely to further the end before us, as that which would suffer, *more antiquo*, the residence of students in lodgings, and apart from the expenses of collegiate life; and that which contemplates the affiliation of such societies as can convince the University that they are, *bonâ fide*, engaged in the work of a liberal education to adults. The best education which can be got is the best course to adopt in order to retrieve ground that has been lost, and to strengthen the future position of the English Church. This education cannot be obtained generally for clergymen in time to come if it is to cost a thousand pounds; it can be and will be got if it is to cost only two or three hundred. It will be the business of those who are engaged in elaborating and ventilating schemes of University extension to prove—first, that the machinery for effecting such an economy is possible; next, that it will be permanent.

J. E. Thorold Rogers.

The Missionary Aspect of Ritualism.

THE latest phase into which the remarkable religious movement of 1833 has entered, is one which has, from its nature, attracted more general attention, and also, it may be added, more unsparing censure, than any of the previous ones. Not that the leaders of the school commonly named Tractarian have ever, save for a brief space about the years 1839—41, found much favour in the eyes of the Fourth Estate; but that the condemnation which formerly came from only one, or at the most two, of the sections within the Church of England, is now pronounced by representative men amongst all save itself. At various times the sympathies of eminent Evangelicals, of the devouter and more hard-working among Broad Churchmen, of the old-fashioned survivors of the school of Lowth and Horsley, and, above all, of those High Churchmen who most nearly approached to the standard of the learned Anglicans of the Revolution era under William III. and Anne, were partially accorded to the followers of the Oxford movement. In fact, so far as the last-named section is concerned, it may not be too much to assert that it gave in its adhesion so far as to come, in the main, into agreement with a higher standard than that of even Bull and Beveridge, namely, the teaching of Taylor and Pearson. Now, on the other hand, the cry of disapprobation is not, as in the earliest stages of the movement, confined to the friends and followers of Whately and Arnold; nor yet, as in the second period, to those of Simeon; nor again, as in the third, to the combination of both of these with the section whose most conspicuous member was the late Bishop Blomfield: but the note is swelled by the voices of that body which claims to represent the eminent Churchmen of the seventeenth century.

It might naturally be supposed that such a storm of disapprobation could do no less than prove or effect the untenability of the Tractarian position in the Anglican Communion, and that a deservedly-earned unpopularity is, in the minds of the objectors, a sure forerunner of the speedy extinction of the obnoxious school. As yet, however, their tone is different. All agree that the opinions and practices impugned are not only far from declining,

but are spreading with portentous vigour and ubiquity, and that the hostility manifested against them scarcely ever comes from those who might naturally be expected to complain of innovations affecting their habits. In a word, it is not the Church parishioners of the ecclesiastics of the later Tractarian school who ask to be protected from their pastors: but the opposition comes from clergymen of a former generation, whose own popularity is waning or has never existed; from Dissenters, who find that a dangerous leakage from them into the channels of the Church has set in contemporaneously with the new movement; and finally, from all that floating mass of irreligion which objects most in every age to that form of Christianity which is most active and aggressive, whether it be Methodist, Evangelical, or Tractarian.

It would be unjust not to add, that amongst the chorus of voices inflamed by polemical rancour or professional jealousy, there are heard some protesting sincerely in the name of spiritual religion against a school which is, in their apprehension, tending to bring in a dead and material formalism; but it is equally true that such are an infinitesimal minority. It is, of course, against that singularly rapid growth of ceremonial observances within the Church of England which has marked the last seven years, that the present outcry is mainly directed; and the form of the objections raised varies according to the school of the objector. The Low Churchman and the rigid Anglican agree in denouncing Ritualism on the ground that it is a deliberate approximation to the usages of the Roman Church, with the object of ultimate union with that body. The Broad Churchmen are divided. One portion of them, whose theological views are perhaps most clearly and consistently set forth in the learned and devout columns of *Punch*, treats the ceremonial revival as the monkey tricks of a few school-boy curates, and sillier, because less educated, choristers and young ladies. To this section it appears that the attraction is exactly on a level with that of an amateur pantomime or fancy ball, with the important exception that instead of amusing the spectators it merely exasperates them. Another section of the same school adopts a different and more scholarly, but not much sounder, view. It cannot be better stated than in the following citation from the first number of the new *Contemporary Review*, in dealing with the Primary Charge of the Bishop of Ely. It may not be going too far to suggest, that the passage probably represents the convictions, if it does not proceed from the pen, of Dean Alford:—

"The busy looking up of mediæval millinery which is now,

with so many of our clergy, usurping the place of the cares and studies to which they have devoted themselves, might be treated as mere childish nonsense, were it not that it originates in and proceeds upon hidden disloyalty to the Church of England, and treachery to her principles. The legitimate scope of all such ritualism is, the Bishop maintains, the recognition of the material Sacrifice of the Mass: in it, in its glorification and adoration, they all culminate, and from it they cannot be logically disjoined. Many of those who have been drawn into the present movement are weak men, unable to apprehend the consequences of their actions; but the prime movers of it are too learned and too able not to know very well what they are about, and whither it is all tending."

This is pretty forcible denunciation, and it may not be a superfluous digression to annotate it a little. The main charges are three: (*a*) That ritualist clergymen neglect their proper cares and studies for the sake of millinery; (*b*) That they do so through disloyalty and treachery to the Church of England; (*c*) That Eucharistic Adoration is the form which their disloyalty takes, and the goal to which they would fain urge all their flocks.

Now, the Ordinal may be accepted as supplying the list of the cares and studies to which the clergy have devoted themselves, and it is:—

1. To administer the doctrine and Sacraments, and the discipline of CHRIST, as the LORD hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same.

2. To banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines.

3. To visit the sick and the whole.

4. To be diligent in prayers and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and such studies as help to the knowledge of the same.

5. To make themselves and their families wholesome examples.

6. To promote unity amongst Christians.

As regards the first of these, the head and front of Tractarian offending is the fact of complying, more nearly than any other section within the Church of England, with this regulation. Whether Tractarians are right or wrong in their practical deductions, it is manifest to any one who chooses to look into the matter, that they are the only Anglicans who so much as profess to be guided by primitive Christian precedent on the one hand, and by English canon and rubrical law on the other. As regards the second pledge, it is only natural that each section should allege that its views are neither strange nor erroneous, and that these

adjectives apply only to opinions which it rejects; but here again there is no tenet taught from Tractarian pulpits which is not found forcibly maintained by divines whose genuine Anglicanism has never been called in doubt, such as Hooker, Andrewes, Taylor, Cosin, Thorndike, and many others. On the other hand, some of the sentiments advocated by Dean Alford in his various writings, whether erroneous or not, are certainly new and strange to the current of Anglican tradition, which at least implies their contradictories. Touching the visitation of the sick and whole, the testimony of the Bishop of London is, that the ritualist clergy of his diocese are, he believes, in many instances, severely injuring their health by their sedulous ministrations amongst the poor, in some of the worst parts of London. He has not hitherto expressed any similar opinion as to the members of the other sections, nor is it metaphysically certain that he would be justified in doing so.

In the matter of prayers and Scripture reading, it is at least probable that men who lay stress on Daily Service will have devoted as much time in any given year to such pursuits, as they do who are content with weekly ministrations. And it may be added, that all the English liturgiologists, with one distinguished exception (and he precisely the one who is not a Tractarian), have been even more active in the publication of devotional works for private use and edification, than in putting forth merely antiquarian and ritual treatises. The paucity of such writings from clergymen of the Broad Church school is noteworthy; and honour is due to Dr. Goulburn for endeavouring, almost alone, to wipe away this blemish. The fifth duty of clergymen, that of presenting a wholesome example to their flocks, is, like the matter of doctrine, susceptible of varying interpretation, according to individual theories; but no exceptional laxity, to say the least, has been laid to the charge of Tractarians as a body. And as to the last pledge of all, the promise to promote quietness, peace, and love among *all* Christian people, it may be observed that the eager desire of Tractarians to bring about a reconciliation with the Churches of Rome and the East, not to speak of their refusal to attempt the narrowing of the Church of England in their own direction, is at least quite as much in accordance with this undertaking, as any controversial vituperation which proceeds from the other sections within the Anglican pale.

There seems, then, a *primâ facie* case made out in favour of the millinery-loving clergy against the unproved charge of neglecting their specified duties. The accusation of disloyalty and

treachery is heavier, but at the same time vaguer and less tangible.

Disloyalty, however, etymologically and morally, means disaffection to the Law. Perhaps the writer in the *Contemporary Review* will be good enough to say who they are who want the Law of the English Church changed, because it does not square with their opinions and practices, and to whom alone, therefore, this term can justly be applied. Treachery implies conscious deceit, and also secret, underhand working. As regards the former, the charge must be dismissed on account of the impossibility of substantiating it, since nothing but an insight into the mental secrets of each person inculpated could, in the absence of documentary proof, establish the truth or falsehood of the charge. But so far as treachery implies secrecy, the plea is in ludicrous opposition to facts. A full-blown Tractarian, who preaches what he believes to be the complete round of Christian doctrine, and who displays the gorgeousness of elaborate ritual in his church, may be a rebel or an enemy, but, at any rate, not a secret plotter. If a wolf, he certainly does not come in sheep's clothing, but with his lupine characteristics even ostentatiously displayed. The evidence of treachery would have to be sought in open or suspected collusion with the enemies of the Church of England. The wildest opponent of Tractarians does not suspect them of alliance with the Liberation Society; nor are they generally credited with habitually seeking the society and joining in the worship of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in England; while the language commonly used of them by those that have left their ranks for the Latin obedience is not, for the most part, affectionate or encouraging. On the other hand, it is on record that the Dean of Canterbury openly joined, at Berlin, during the year 1857, in a "Communion" with a mixed assembly of Lutherans, Calvinists, Independents, Anabaptists, and Methodists, some of them representing sects whose main tenet is hostility to the Church of England, and all of them disowned by her and rejected from ministering in her churches. Any one who chose to employ the terms disloyalty and treachery to such a proceeding, could find plausible support for his language in the expressions of Anglican canons and rubrics.

With the last and specific charge of the *Contemporary Review*, limiting the accusation of disaffection on the part of Tractarians to the maintenance of one particular dogma, it is enough, without entering into a theological defence, for which this is not the occasion, to point out that nearly the latest apology for Eucharistic Adoration is from the pen of the revered

author of the *Christian Year*, whose loyalty to the English Church is at least as unimpeachable as Dean Alford's, and whose familiarity with her teaching is probably as great as that of the Bishop of Ely.

This part of the subject would be incomplete without the citation of an unfriendly Roman Catholic opinion:—

"The start which has been made during the last few years, in the direction of ceremonial religion, apart from any corresponding advance in sensitiveness to the necessity of an ordained provision for dogmatic teaching, appears to me to be, not only not a gain, but a distinct and conspicuous evil. It can have no other effect than to amuse with mere baubles a number of good men who mistake the form for the substance . . . . I do not, indeed, deny that their mimicries of Catholic ceremonial may do us a service in familiarizing the minds of Englishmen with a type of worship which had been totally obliterated; but this is a very different thing from saying that they represent a reality where they are, or can be otherwise than most injurious to them, by leading them to confound the outward show with the true spirit of Catholicity[1]."

That is to say, in plainer language, the advocates of ritual within the Church of England are not Roman Catholics, nor likely to become so; and their practices tend to keep a number of persons within the Anglican Communion, who would have otherwise abandoned it for one which could supply their cravings after a stately worship. Mr. Oakeley's objection is, so far, not founded on abstract speculation, but on statistical facts. The average number of converts to the Roman Church in England has conspicuously diminished, ever since the last phase of the Tractarian movement began; and the few who still drop away are of considerably less mark and influence than at any former time.

Now that the ground has been to some extent cleared by stating the opinions current outside the Tractarian ranks as to the character and value of the ritual observance which prevails within them, it is fitting to put forward the view which the ritualists themselves hold, and the reasons which seem to them to justify it. There are two factors which go to make up the sum of their proceedings, to wit, dogma and practical expediency.

As this is not a theological treatise, it will suffice to say of the former, that Ritual is in some sort the visible exponent of particular tenets, which are more or less prevalent in the Church of

[1] "The Leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work."—A Letter to Archbishop Manning, by the Rev. F. Oakeley. Longmans. 1866.

England, and which could not be dislodged from their position without a schism in the present, and an irreparable breach with the past. The contradictory of Mr. Oakeley's proposition is the simple fact; for it is only when the dogmatic system taught by the great Tractarian leaders has made itself realized as a living creed, that ceremonial worship has become practicable or intelligible. It may not be forgotten that in a former day, and notably about 1842, sporadic attempts to revive various external rites were made, and that they fell through (just as two hundred years before in the Laudian movement), not so much because suppressed, or even because ridiculed, as because they did not spring naturally out of matured theological convictions. In *Loss and Gain* some examples of this merely dilettante spirit are mercilessly derided. But the phenomenon which has to be dealt with now, is that ceremonial observances, every where in England to-day, co-exist with active parochial and missionary work, and are regarded by practical men, perfectly free from effeminate sentimentality, as important adjuncts in their labours. In short, Ritualism is not employed as a side-wind, by which to bring in certain tenets surreptitiously, but as the natural complement of those tenets after they have been long and sedulously inculcated. For this reason it is plain, that the gentlemen who are agitating for legislative changes in the anti-ritual direction, have adopted a policy which is logically indefensible. They profess to regard ceremonial observances as insignificant in themselves, and as dangerous only because they tend to suggest and lead up to certain controverted opinions. But they do not venture to meddle with the avowed advocates of those very opinions, who have been stating the objectionable matter in the plainest words for the last dozen years. If the views are in themselves unsound and contrary to Anglican formularies, the natural weapon against their maintainers is formal impeachment for heresy; and the various ritual practices can be regarded only as subordinate matter affording collateral proof of disaffection. If, on the other hand, the Tractarians are in fair legal possession of their position in the Church of England, even if they are not what they themselves (in common with a large body of intelligent outsiders) believe, the *only* persons with a full and incontrovertible moral claim to represent that Church, it is mere factious spite to fasten on a method of annoying them, without any reasonable prospect of driving them from the main redoubt. And the counter-efforts of their opponents are carried on with the same nice adaptation of means to ends, as that of a cockney deer-stalker firing at a stag with snipe-shot.

Of course, if the anti-ritualists choose to shift their ground, and to declare now that ceremonies are the matters of chief importance, and doctrine a purely secondary thing, it is competent for them to do so, as they have in fact done very lately in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette;* but up to the present they had argued, rightly enough, in a converse manner. It is just because ritual is the fruit of dogma, and not its root, that those who dislike ceremonial are safe from any attempt at compulsory uniformity urged from the Tractarian school. An advanced High Churchman would feel as much dislike to seeing rites employed without any reference to their inner meaning, as he would to putting manuals of prayer couched in exceptionally fervid language into the hands of beginners in devotion. Formalism would be as certainly the result in the one case, as sentimental unreality in the other; and because this truth is thoroughly understood, no Puritan or Broad Church clergyman runs the least risk of being forced to adopt observances which he either actively dislikes or passively misunderstands. If any compulsion be applied at all, it is certain to come from a lay quarter, and not from a clerical one. The real secret of the intense hostility which has been manifested of late, is, that the ritual movement is obviously a successful missionary agency; and those sections of the Church which are either non-missionary in their essence, or which have lost the missionary spirit, naturally object to a course of procedure which is not merely a tacit reproach to them, but which visibly thins their following.

The causes of such a state of things are not far to seek, inasmuch as they spring out of ordinary human passions and motives. The abstract examination of the whole question, supposing that a theory of Divine worship, as generally suitable to the public needs, were being for the first time thought out, before being put into practice, is not favourable to what is commonly called Simplicity. For the true idea of an effective Church, that idea which is formulated in the word Catholic, is, that it should not merely be fully capable of adaptation to the habits of all climates and nations, but that in each nation it should meet the wants of all classes of society and all types of mind. Human imperfection and error will always fall more or less short of realizing such an ideal; but in proportion as approximation is made to it, will the vital power of the Church be. Tested by any such standard, three of the great sections within the English Church utterly fail, and are self-branded as class-religions, with no faculty for general absorption.

The great Evangelical school (inclusive of what is called Ortho-

dox Dissent), which possesses, or at any rate once did possess conspicuous merits, has never approved itself, broadly speaking, to the highest or the lowest strata of society. Its deficiency of culture has alienated the former, its merely subjective character has proved too intangible for the latter; and thus, even if it did not exhibit patent marks of irrecoverable decay, it could at best rank only as a creed for the lower middle-class. Therefore it never can be more than a mere subordinate section, with no message for two-thirds of those with whom it professes to deal.

If this be so of a school which at one time did really try to become national, much more is it the case with that old-fashioned section which has been aptly, if not very courteously, named High and Dry. The notion of active propagandism never seems for a moment to have suggested itself to men of this stamp, nor do they appear to have ever been a real spiritual power in the country. Many persons learned, amiable, charitable, and devout have unquestionably adorned this section; but, in its turn, it has failed to reach the very class on which the Evangelicals seized; while any influence it may have had with the poor is due solely to the natural weight of feodal pressure exerted by the squirearchy (its main strength) in rural districts; and in towns it has not had even this to show.

Least missionary of all, and more emphatically a class-religionist than either of the former, the Broad Churchman errs most from a Catholic aim. Not only has he not reached, or tried to reach the poor, but even within his own sphere, his influence is of necessity limited by very narrow bounds. Appealing to books rather than to men, more familiar with the library than with the parish, doing all with reference to intellect at the price of neglecting the imagination and the affections, he might perhaps succeed in establishing a sect of cultivated Christian philosophers, a Porch or an Academy of the learned, but he must break down when trying to deal with those terrible forms of moral and physical evil with which society is beset. The bland tolerance of our New Academy, the graceful stoicism of our modern Peripatetics, however well they may sit on a courteous gentleman in the repose of his study, or in genial intercourse with those of his own rank and cultivation, are but poor helps by the dying bed of a cancer-patient, by the side of a betrayed and deserted woman tempted to despair and suicide, by the remorseful agonies of a sinner in his first thoughts of repentance, by the cloudy perplexities of one who begins to think that the universe is without a GOD.

Nay, more, the influence of Broad Churchmanship is practi-

cally felt by one sex and age alone. It is singularly ill-adapted to women and children; and the paucity of its devotional literature, to which reference has already been made, indicates this fact. It is not easy to conceive the idea of a Broad-Church lady, without mentally dissociating from it that atmosphere of tenderness and prayer which one feels to be the natural element of a religious woman, of an Elizabeth Fry and a Lucy Hutchinson, not less than of a Jane Frances de Chantal, or a Eugénie de Guérin. The thought of a strong-minded person with a critical turn is instinctively suggested; and, whether rightly or wrongly, such a picture is by no means the feminine ideal most in favour with either sex.

Much more is this true of a child. Literature is not without attractive sketches of the tiny Puritan and the tiny Catholic, marking their progress from infancy to the verge of adolescence; but the mind refuses to contemplate a Broad-Church boy or girl except in the light of an intolerable prig. Why it should be so, is not easy to say; but it is impossible to read the religious and educational literature of the school without noticing that absence of appeal to the higher faculties of a child's nature, which is so remarkable a peculiarity of Miss Edgeworth's books for the young. There is a very wide difference between unduly stimulating a child's sense of the unseen, so as to make it a premature and self-conscious devotee or hypocrite, and starving its spiritual faculty from sheer lack of food to give it; and the latter charge is one from which Broad Churchmen do not seem to be clear. The very epithet "manly," which they are fond of claiming as especially their own, shows, by the restricted sense in which it is employed, a neglect of the other aspects of Christianity; and thus, even if every adult man were to join that particular school (an event by no means impending), nearly four-fifths of the population would still be unaccounted for and unimpressed. It may be for this reason, that so little in the way of practical Christian work has been effected, or even attempted, by this section in its collective capacity; and that the favourite attitude of its hierophants seems to be that of the gods of Epicurus, seated high above the warring factions of the world, and infinitely too blest in self-contemplation to do more than cast an occasional glance of pity, or of contempt, on mere mortal struggles.

Furthermore, there is one weighty fact which makes against this school. It is, as all know, divided into two sections, which the *Fortnightly Review* has distinguished as the Broad-with-unction and the Broad-without-unction. The former of these is in the main being absorbed into the moderate High Church

ranks; the latter is drifting daily further away from all sympathy with Anglicanism. And though a school which has not had a sense of honour sufficiently delicate to disown Mr. Bristow Wilson, and some of whose leaders have had the inconceivable bad taste, not to say indecency, to subsidize Bishop Colenso, cannot claim to be transcendentally scrupulous in the matter of signing formularies; yet it is clear that it lacks the prospect of vitality. The young men who sit at the feet of its teachers seldom or never take Holy Orders; and therefore the school, as a clerical power, carries within itself the germs of speedy decay and extinction. As it thus practically breaks with the Church of England by failing to provide her with recruits, it must be held to have retired from active interest and share in the war against heathenism at home or abroad.

All the sections of the English Church, save one, have stood their trial, and have failed. The High and Dry from the beginning of George III.'s reign, the Evangelicals from the French Revolution, the Latitudinarians in their first period from William III. to George II. inclusively, and in their second stage from the accession of George IV. to the present day, have severally tried to include all classes within their ranks, and have in no wise succeeded.

The Tractarian now claims his turn. He too may fail as others have done; but he is at least entitled to the same clear stage as they, and he can point to current events, which show that he has a right to entertain hopes not entirely chimerical. In the earlier phase of the Oxford movement, so soon, at any rate, as it had passed out of common-rooms into parsonages, it was remarked that nearly the only persons whom it seemed to influence, outside the circle of clerics and their female adherents, were persons of high rank and station. To them, and to their supposed monoply of æsthetic perceptions, Anglo-Catholicism, with its black-letter learning, its pretty asceticisms, and its religious *bric-à-brac* in the shape of antique calf bindings, velvet faldstools and *prie-Dieus*, and engravings after Overbeck, seemed eminently adapted, inasmuch as it was, as an indiscreet votary observed, a "religion for gentlemen." After a little, it was discovered that a good deal of kindly charity underlay the surface dilettantism, and by it much was done towards conciliating the rural poor, who found their bodies much better, and their souls not worse looked after, than had been the case under a former rule. Still, there was a huge gap unfilled; and while Tractarians seemed to have really effected a lodgment in the two extremes of society, the great centre remained entirely unaffected.

So it continued so long as the movement had not progressed beyond what may perhaps be called, with no offensive intent, its Tory stage, when it was thought to be true of the luxury or splendour of religion, that

> "It was not meant for village churls,
> But for high dames and mighty earls."

Ritualism was then a thing of private oratories, and perhaps thought of by a few as not inapposite in the splendid, but neglected cathedrals. But its fitness and utility in the ordinary parish church were not even suggested by the original leaders of the Oxford movement; many of the survivors of which are still personally unaffected by the change in the posture of affairs, though their sympathies are more or less heartily given to the restorers of magnificence in worship. It is not conceivable that it could have been otherwise. For the first authors of the Tractarian movement had to begin at the very outset, to arouse the clergy to a sense of their powers and responsibilities, to revive forgotten verities, to train a body of teachers. Appealing, as they did, to a highly-educated class and to no other, their weapons were solely literary; and it would have been premature to speculate or lay down rules concerning the practical application of their principles, before those principles had emerged from the cloistered shades of a small University city into the busy haunts of more active but less intellectual life. But many of the views which they advocated, necessarily lead up to ceremonial observance as one of their logical results. The constant appeal to antiquity, the tenets of the dignity of the human body and of the superiority of prayer over preaching, the appreciation of symbolism, the magnifying the Sacraments as spiritual agents, could no otherwise be practically brought within the observation of the mass of Christians, which has neither taste nor leisure for abstruse research. And this is one of the reasons why, as has been said before in this paper, Simplicity, that is, bareness and poverty in the externals of worship, is unsuited for a national, much less for a universal religion.

One of the great practical strides made in the education of the humbler classes of late years, has been the introduction of what are called Object Lessons, wherein, instead of reading and committing to memory by rote an account, for example, of the qualities of caoutchouc, a piece of india-rubber is shown to the class, and subjected to various tests, by which its elastic, inflammable, detergent, and other powers are clearly explained and made part of the domain of the understanding, instead of being a

mere dead-weight in the memory; and such lessons are amongst the most popular in every national school.

Ritualism is the Object Lesson of religion; and how popular it is, can be said by those only who have seen its working amongst a poor population in towns. It affords a common ground where high and low can meet, for there are certain cravings for the beautiful common to both, which are certainly not gratified by the ordinary Sunday routine. Its absence and, above all, its prohibition, are at once open to the objection that all persons of refined, artistic, and imaginative tastes and faculties are put at a disadvantage in the matter of religion, and are compelled to seek a vent for these natural instincts either in secular pursuits alone, or in another religious system. The same is true, and more generally true, of women, and most true of all in the case of children, to whom a church-going Sunday is too often a terrible weariness of the flesh. A Church which refuses to provide for such cases, and they count by hundreds of thousands, at once stamps itself as a class-religion, and forfeits all claim to Catholicity of purpose.

It may be argued, that good and vigorous preaching will fill the cravings of the imagination, and make the employment of material stimuli superfluous, if not mischievous. But good preaching is amongst the rarest of good things, rarer even than good acting, because it requires a wider range of physical and mental gifts. If very good actors were common, the adventitious aid of scenery and properties would be comparatively unimportant, because the harmonious action of all the persons of the drama would be sufficient to create an illusion, able to rivet the attention of the spectators. But, as the great majority of actors are mere sticks, and even the chief stars are not always shining at their best, managers have constantly been compelled to make gorgeous spectacle their main attraction, and a splendid transformation scene, or a telling stage procession, will draw crowds night after night, even in the absence of any theatrical celebrity.

Hence a lesson may be learnt, by all who are not too proud to learn from the stage. For it is an axiom in liturgiology, that no public worship is really deserving of its name, unless it be histrionic. Histrionic for three reasons:—First, because it is an attempt to imitate and represent on earth what Christians believe to be going on in Heaven. Secondly, because this representation is partly effected by the employment of material symbols, to shadow forth invisible powers. Thirdly, because personal action, rather than passive receptivity, is the essence of its character. The whole histrionic principle is conceded and hallowed by the

two most sacred rites of the Christian religion, Baptism, which physically suggests the idea of moral cleansing, and the Holy Eucharist, which shows forth the broken Body and the outpoured Blood, at the same time that it presents to the mind the notion of sustenance.

To adopt another principle, whether it be that of sermon-hearing or meditation, may be salutary enough in its proper time and place, but it is not worship, with which alone ritual has to do. As the employment of symbolical and objective teaching by no means excludes, even indirectly, the fullest use of oral instruction, it is clear that a ritual service satisfies a larger number of conditions, and meets a greater number of cases, than an inornate method of Divine Service can provide for. The great practical defect of the English Prayer Book, next to its want of plasticity, is its rigidly intellectual cast, which makes it in some degree unsuited to all very ignorant persons and all children. The sermons with which it is commonly supplemented, though they are by no means too intellectual as a rule, are a great deal less comprehensible in diction than the prayers, psalms, and lessons, and do not go for much as missionary agencies. Hence the trite saying, that "the Church of England is the Church of the poor," is only very partially true, as that Church is worked by anti-ritualists. It is true, in so far that every man, however poor, has a right at common law to a place in his parish church, and to free participation, unless canonically disqualified, in all the ordinary means of grace. But it is not true, that the poorer strata of society, counting from the lower middle class downwards, avail themselves to any important extent of these privileges, or, indeed, that any adequate inducement is held out for them to do so.

Hasty generalization from a few exceptional country parishes, thinly peopled, will not disprove this unhappy truth. In a place where every particular of a man's life, habits, family, and earnings are known to every one else, continual absence from church means perpetual black marks against the offender in the parson's book, and most probably in the squire's also, and is likely to affect injuriously such contingent benefits as allotments, renewed lease of cottages, Christmas doles, and the like. Even where such direct and tangible inducements are not present, another fact must be borne in mind. The intolerable dulness, the dreary vacuity of rustic life, needs some change, some relaxation, however dun-coloured; and going to church is, at any rate, an improvement on staying at home. How the bucolic mind in most cases is affected by the sermon, has never been better expressed than by Mr. Tennyson's Northern Farmer:—

"An' I hallus comed to 's choorch afoor moy Sally war deäd,
An' 'eerd un a bummin' awaäy like a buzzard-clock over my yeäd,
An' I niver knaw'd whot a meän'd, but I thowt a 'ad summut to saäy,
An' I thowt a said whot a owt to 'a said, an' I comed awaäy."

But in a great city, with its manifold attractions and temptations, together with the practical impossibility of noting individuals precisely, the matter is very different, in that the Church has abundant competitors for the company of the artisan and the labourer.

And here again, a lesson may be learnt from one of the least pleasant forms of ordinary life. There is no institution so widely and universally popular amongst the London poor as the gin-palace. Given the craving for drink, and it would seem that no additional inducement would be needful to lure customers across the threshold, and to retain them as long as possible on the premises. Yet it is not so. A gin-palace, whose entrance is up a couple of steps from the footway, or whose doors do not swing open readily at a touch, is at a commercial disadvantage when compared with others on the street level and with patent hinges. Nay, more, internal decoration, abundant polished metal and vivid colour, with plenty of bright light, is found to pay, and to induce people to stay on drinking, just because every thing is so pretty and cheerful to the eye, and so unlike the squalid discomfort of their own sordid homes. Many landlords have found even all this insufficient, without the additional attraction of music; and the low singing-hall is sure to indicate the most thriving drinking-shops in the worst quarters of the metropolis. If, then, painting, light, and music are found necessary adjuncts in a trade which has already enlisted on its side one of the strongest of human passions, it is the merest besotted folly to reject their assistance, when endeavouring to persuade men to accept and voluntarily seek an article for which they have never learnt to care, even if they are not actively hostile to it—to wit, Religion.

This fact is seized on by secular bodies whose aim is to gather as many members as possible from the lower orders. Societies like the Odd Fellows and the Foresters find the ordinary routine of business meetings, even though directly beneficial to their members, insufficient to insure cohesion; and consequently elaborate processions, with badges, music, and banners, are found needful appliances for attracting members, and keeping them together;

and there is reason to believe that their abandonment would lead to the collapse of any such society, which should determine to go in for Simplicity.

The Tractarians alone, of all the schools in the Church of England, have recognized this truth, and appraised it at its true value; and it is in their churches alone, or in those of clergymen who have been wise enough to copy their example, even when differing from their principles, that the poor can really be found. It is a matter of notoriety; so much so as to be no longer matter of reproach, that Dissent does not deal with the very destitute and needy. It is matter of reproach, though not of as much notoriety as it ought to be, that the High and Dry and the Puritan ecclesiastics have no hold whatsoever on them. Partly from the pew-system, to which men so unlike in other respects as Archdeacon Denison and Canon M'Neile equally cling (though, in justice to the former it must be said, in a very different way, and from very dissimilar notions), and partly from a refusal to face the fact, that it is with beings with human wants and frailties, and not with pure disembodied rationalities that the Church has to deal, the shopkeepers and artisans have gone to Dissent, and the labourers have gone to the Devil.

The immediate result, wherever ritualism has been given a fair trial, is, that the proportion of men present in church is exceptionally large, and that all ranks of society are represented in the congregations, instead of delegates from one or at most two sections being found. This might be plausibly accounted for in the case of the very rich and the very poor, by causes which have been already mentioned; but the most remarkable fact, is the flocking-in of Dissenters, and of the members of the small tradesman class in general, from which the ranks of Dissent have been hitherto recruited, and which is traditionally considered to be rootedly hostile to ceremonial observances. It has not adopted them, no doubt; but the reason is just that which makes the peasants of Ireland and Scotland live on potatoes and oatmeal, and those of England drink a filthy and poisonous decoction misnamed beer, not that meat and wine are disliked, but that they cannot be come by. The only chance which a working man had, until very lately, of seeing the least approach to ritual solemnity in worship, was by attending a cathedral. And what between inconvenient hours, close seats, elaborately florid and uncongregational services, general chilliness, and, above all, insolent vergers, the impression likely to be made on his mind was not calculated to excite much religious enthusiasm. But a certain hostility against Anglicanism he did no doubt feel, and it was mainly political in

its nature, inasmuch as he was apt to consider parsons as the most obnoxious members of a dominant and oppressive caste. With the democratic aspect which the Church has practically assumed in the hands of the Tractarian party, of which the vigorous anti-pew movement is an exponent, this suspicious temper has been gradually vanishing; and as the artisan finds more to attract him in a gorgeous worship, wherein he is encouraged to take an active part, than in a bald office of which he is only a bored, or at any rate an unimpressed spectator, he is ready enough to give in his adhesion.

The difficulty in which the Anglican opponents of ritual are placed, is this:—The very existence of the Book of Common Prayer, taken at the very lowest standard of actual practice, compels the adoption of the ceremonial principle; and the rest is simply a question of degree, to be settled by law and utility. There can be great solemnity and impressiveness produced by a perfectly unritual service. No man, with any imaginative faculty, can fail to recognize the austere and savage grandeur of a Covenanting or Huguenot gathering for worship on a mountain-side in times of persecution, or to see the picturesque aspect of even the far less interesting American camp-meetings.

But these are in their essence exceptional and spasmodic; and never have been treated as the normal type to be followed under ordinary circumstances, even by those who most approve them. The memories and associations which are grouped about the English Prayer Book have endeared it so much to many thousands, that they cannot understand how it should fail to attract outsiders, by its literary merits alone. But the way to test it, is to bring a religious foreigner, or a comparatively uneducated Dissenter into a church where no variation from the average parochial routine is to be found; and the verdict will, in almost every instance, be unfavourable. There is nothing to impress the eye, nothing to quicken the attention, nothing to make the breath come short, or the pulse beat quicker. There is not the sense of awful, brooding calm, which those who know what a Presbyterian Communion Day in Scotland is, when conducted by ministers of a high stamp, will remember with respect. There is not the swing and heartiness of a Wesleyan meeting. There is not the mysterious and symbolical pomp of a Roman Catholic church. It is very sedate, very decorous, very good, no doubt, for those who like it; but it is not in the very least degree missionary. The Evangelical school has practically admitted this truth by its adoption of theatre-preachings, thereby confessing on the one hand that it is hopeless of making the Church service

attractive to outsiders, and on the other that some fillip of excitement in the way of novelty is needful as a lure. While the Tractarian "compels men to come in" to the spiritual banquet, the Puritan is content with distributing some broken fragments of the repast to loiterers in the highways, and the Latitudinarian neither feasts himself nor invites a guest, but tells the police to make Lazarus move on.

And this practical failure of the Anglican service is just because men have failed to observe that ritualism is the natural complement of a written liturgy; and that in giving the one without the other they are deliberately sacrificing half the effect intended. What an oratorio would be without instrumentation; what jewels uncut and unset are; what a handsome house in this country is without hangings, curtains, carpets, mirrors, or pictures, that, and worse than that, is the Prayer Book without ritual. To the assertion, only partially true, that the Prayer Book has been without it for three hundred years, the obvious reply is to ask—What has become, in consequence, of the millions who ought to come to church, but who prefer to stay away? The musical illustration may thus be further drawn out. The Prayer Book, with its somewhat antique phraseology and high spiritual level, is to the mass of uneducated worshippers like the score of a piece of music, simply unintelligible. Those on a somewhat higher mental and religious level will catch something of its meaning, as a learner in music will partly apprehend the written notes, while only a trained musician will appreciate the full meaning of the piece. Put the score into the hands of a band of musicians for execution, and all will benefit from the harmony. So, too, let the dramatic aspect of Common Prayer be manifested, and every one can join, however uninstructed.

A little knowledge of Ecclesiastical History would lead to very different conclusions from those of the anti-ritualists; for it may be laid down as clearly established in the case of all missions, ancient or modern, of which we have any tolerably complete account, or regarding which we can form any probable conjecture, that the successful ones have invariably used the aid of ceremonial observances (except in the two cases of Islam and Calvinism, which used the sword alone, and which, when deprived of power to persecute, have also lost the power of converting); and that those which have neglected them, have either never succeeded for a moment, or have pined away as soon as the presence of some one person of exceptional genius, on whose single arm the whole strength of the mission depended, was withdrawn by removal or death. A few palmary examples from various epochs

will be sufficient to establish the fact; but it is necessary to preface them with some words as to the state of the matter in the earliest ages of Christianity.

There is a notion, very widely held, and in part encouraged by the error of the Authorized Version in 1 Corinthians i. 26, that the Christian religion, for some two centuries or more after its foundation, spread only amongst the outcasts, the slaves, and the neediest artisans of the Roman Empire; and, as a corollary from this theory, that Christian worship must necessarily have been at first the barest and simplest conceivable, because of the poverty of the faithful, even if no other cause contributed to such a result. This idea not only contradicts the plain language of S. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians, wherein he twice refers to the spread of Christianity in the Imperial household, and the uniform tradition which represents some of the earliest converts, such as Pudens, as of senatorial rank, and others, like Flavia Domitilla, as actually members of the reigning family; but is also inconsistent with the later discoveries of archæologists, from which it is manifest that there was no lack, from the very earliest time which can be traced, of high-born and wealthy persons in the infant community. Poverty, therefore, would not have compelled simplicity; and the language of the earliest Liturgies and of the Apostolical Constitutions (which were certainly drawn up, in the main, long before persecution had ceased), forbid us to conjecture that there ever was any theological bias against ritual.

We are not left without sufficient indications in the writings of such early divines as S. Ignatius, S. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and S. Clement of Alexandria, that the Jewish idea of typical worship was never laid aside; but, not to dwell on this somewhat recondite part of the subject, it will be sufficient to remark two things in general disproof of the theory of primitive bareness of worship. One is the list, given by Baluze, of the church plate taken from the Christians of Cirta about the year A.D. 303, the date of the great Tenth Persecution. It includes eight chalices—two gold and the rest silver—six silver flagons, and a silver kettle (probably for the warm water used in the Oriental liturgies), seven silver lamps, two standards for lights, and about eighteen more lamps and candlesticks of bronze. Now Cirta, though the strongest fortress of Numidia, had fallen so much into decay that it became necessary to rebuild it a few years after this date, and it took from its new founder the name which it still bears—Constantina. Therefore, as a mere military outpost, it was not at all likely to have had a wealthy resident population; and if so much plunder could be got from one church

there (a quantity which far exceeds the stock of plate in an Anglican cathedral now), it may readily be conjectured what wealth was heaped up in the shrines of cities like Antioch, Corinth, or York. The other fact deserving attention, is the account given by Eusebius of the elaborate ceremonies observed at the renovation, under Constantine, of the churches which had been desecrated or overthrown during the rule of Diocletian and Maximinian. It is not to be credited for a moment that the Church was ready with an improvised ritual, and that she was not merely exhibiting in the light of day those observances which had been previously relegated to the catacombs and other secret places.

The first circumstance which meets the inquirer, is that all the very ancient Churches, especially those of Apostolic or sub-Apostolic origin, ascribed not only their conversion, but the settlement of their liturgical forms to the earliest preachers of the Faith amongst them. And the diversities of type which have distinguished the five great families of liturgies from one another for at least sixteen hundred years, prove their partially independent origin: while their still more remarkable points of agreement testify to the existence of a common norm, susceptible indeed of minor variations, but in the main tolerably fixed, and the true parent of all the others. The still extant offices which bear the names of S. James, S. Mark, and S. Adæus, are all but unquestionably coeval with their reputed authors; and as much can be said for the fragments of the original Ephesine Liturgy imbedded in Gallican and Spanish offices, and probably due to S. John the Evangelist. The tradition is so uniform, so consistent, so completely free from any early hint of doubt, so thoroughly in accordance with the positive statements and the more convincing, because more subtil and casual, allusions found in the very early Christian writers, that an impartial student is compelled to admit that careful legislation for the external solemnities of Divine Service was amongst the earliest cares of the Apostles for their newly-gathered flocks. And the unanimous agreement of liturgies used by nations most widely separated by race, dwelling, and language, teach us that amongst these solemnities were special vestments (often very magnificent), lights, incense, processions, genuflexions, and perhaps, but less certainly, the use of banners and flowers for the purposes of decoration. That which is only inferential, though closely approaching demonstrable certainty, as regards the Apostles, admits of no doubt in the case of later, yet still early, propagators of Christianity. Especially is this true of S. Gregory the Illuminator, Apostle of Armenia, and of three of the most successful contenders with dying, but still mus-

cular and struggling paganism — S. Ambrose, S. Basil the Great, and S. Gregory Nazianzen. The two former not only still hold their rank amongst the foremost of ancient divines and preachers, but were actually the chief compilers of all the elaborate rites (save a few minor interpolations) which still perpetuate their names in Lombardy and Greece.

As we descend lower down the stream of history, details become at once more precise and more abundant. Foremost stands the powerful and mainly successful effort of S. John Chrysostom to reclaim the populace of Constantinople from Arian dissent. The means he employed, though based on that thorough knowledge of human nature which he possessed, and eminently productive of the effect he sought to produce, were singularly unlike what an English Bishop at the present day would ever think of using against a dangerous form of error, popularly current in his diocese. A good deal of the Arian success was due to their processions and hymns. S. Chrysostom determined to meet them on their own ground; and, by organizing far more magnificent processions, with all the apparatus of crosses, banners, and incense, together with the aid of powerful and well-trained choirs, chanting hymns more swinging and effective than his rivals had used, succeeded in thinning the Arian congregations, and in filling his own churches with reverent attendants at the gorgeous ritual which yet bears his name, and holds the first rank still as the office of more than sixty millions of Christians. And the most supercilious despiser of ceremonial in the present day will hardly venture to sneer at the great Confessor Bishop, as a mere lover of millinery and neglecter of more solemn things.

Almost about the same time was made the triumphant attack of S. Martin upon the idolatry of Gaul, the history of which may be read in the pages of Sulpicius Severus. He too opposed the attractions of paganism with those of the stately ceremonial of the Catholic Church, and thus provided a continuous bond to keep together those converts who had been first collected around him by the fame of his austerities, his miracles, and his eloquence.

That a similar policy was pursued by the great missionaries who won the barbarian conquerors of Rome to the Cross, is tolerably well known to persons of even ordinary cultivation; and the eventful era of the fifth and sixth centuries may therefore be passed over with this slight allusion. The thread is best taken up again with the famous story of the landing of S. Augustine in England. That great man knew that much of his future prospect of success depended on the first impression made on the Kentish monarch, and he was careful to take his

measures accordingly. The monastic company advanced in solemn procession, headed by the bearer of a silver cross, after whom came one who bore aloft a painting of the Redeemer, glowing with gold and colour. As they passed on to the place of meeting, they chanted the Litany; and on their arrival, Augustine took the picture as his text, and spoke to Ethelbert of Him whom it symbolized. When their audience was over, they returned, as they had come, in procession, again chanting the Litanies which they had learnt in Rome. The striking ceremony riveted attention and provoked inquiry; and there is no need to tell, how the seed sown on that day shot up into one of the stateliest trees of the forest. Such, too, was the method of the great Celtic evangelizers of Germany—Columbanus, Gall, and Kilian—and still more remarkably the policy of S. Willibrord and S. Boniface, and the noble band of followers who carried on the work, especially Sturmi of Fulda and Liudger of Utrecht.

More dramatic, though not more in accordance with the principle here advanced, is the story of the conversion of S. Vladimir, Grand Prince of Kieff, and, through him, of the whole Russian nation—a greater missionary victory than had been won since the time of the Apostles, and incomparably surpassing all that has been done since by the combined efforts of all Christian bodies. He is said to have been visited by emissaries from the Jews, the Mohammedans, the Latins, and the Greeks. The Byzantine envoy was the only one who made any way with him, and that was achieved (like the conversion of Bogoris, King of Bulgaria) by the exhibition of a painting of the Last Judgment, such as are common in Eastern monasteries to the present day. Next year, Vladimir sent out messengers in his turn, who were instructed to make inquiries concerning the various religions, and to bring him back a faithful account of what they saw. At that time Constantinople was the wealthiest city of Europe, and S. Sophia the most gorgeous church in the world. The elaborate and splendid ritual of the Chrysostomic Liturgy, the vestments, the singing, the lights, incense, and processions, astounded the Muscovite envoys, and on their return they said as follows:—"When we stood in the temple, we did not know where we were, for there is nothing else like it upon earth: there, in truth, GOD has His dwelling with men; and we can never forget the beauty we saw there. No one who has once tasted sweets will afterwards take that which is bitter; nor can we now abide any longer in heathenism[1]."

[1] Mouravieff, History of the Russian Church, ch. i.

There remains one other example from the Middle Ages which deserves citation, because of the unusually full details which we possess, thanks to the zeal of a mediæval Boswell. It is the conversion of Pomerania by S. Otto of Bamberg. Pomerania, unlike most early mission-fields, was prosperous and wealthy, and the rites of Slavonic heathenism were celebrated in its temples with much pomp by the members of a rich and respected priesthood. The first missionary who attempted the conversion of the country, did so merely as a preacher, and that too in the garb of a mendicant, without any ritualism to back his efforts. His poverty was derided, and his sermons unheeded by the genial, but Epicurean burghers of Julin, and he retired in despair. He had tact enough, however, to recognize in Otto a man who could do the work in which he had failed, and urged him on to make the attempt. The sagacious German, exactly reversing the plan of his Spanish predecessor Bernard, entered Pomerania with a gorgeous retinue of priests and soldiers, and preached his first sermon to the assembled multitudes, not in the garb of a beggar, but in the splendid vestments of his episcopal rank. So too, when he destroyed the great temple at Gützkow, he replaced it by a church far more magnificent; and at a later period overawed an infuriated heathen mob in Stettin, by boldly advancing in procession with his clergy, chanting psalms with the Cross borne before them[2]. Exactly as S. Chrysostom had done more than seven hundred years previously, Otto of Bamberg fought his enemies with their own weapons, and triumphed over them.

We are thus brought down to the middle of the twelfth century, without any perceptible variation in the mode of proselytizing, or the degree of success attained. It is sufficient for the remaining time to cite two cases: one, the substitution of practical reform and vigorous spiritual life for an effete and corrupted Christianity; the other, the spread of the Gospel amongst savage tribes. And when the names of S. Charles Borromeo, with his marvellous work of revival in Milan, and those of Anchieta and Baraza with their successes amongst the Indians of Paraguay are mentioned, even detraction must be silent. In each case, ceremonial observance was carefully insisted on: on the one hand, to recall a careless, if not dissolute, clergy to a due sense of the great solemnity of its functions; on the other, to impress and teach a race of puny intellectual power.

This part of the subject may finally be closed by remarking, that attachment to the ritual observances of their religion and

[2] Vit. B. Othonis, ap. Canis. Thes. Mon. 3. ii. 35—97.

country (and that with scarcely any aid from books or preaching) served to keep the fire of a national spirit alive in Russia, all through the disastrous epochs of Tatar and Polish invasion and tyranny, and had the same effect in preserving the Greek race from being utterly crushed out or absorbed under Turkish domination.

In turning the reverse of the medal, it is best to begin by naming the most prominent examples of the evil of an unceremonial use of liturgical forms. The two cases which are closest to our doors, and whose history can be most readily verified, are those of the Established Church of Ireland and the dis-established Church of Scotland. How completely the former, though called by some of its panegyrists a Missionary Church, has broken down in dealing with the Roman Catholic population, need not be insisted on. It is enough to say, that even if the Reports of the proselytizing Societies were as true as they are unscrupulously mendacious, the results would be a very poor return for three centuries of monopoly. But there is another aspect of the matter, which is less understood in England. It is, that, bating a very small number of zealots, the Irish Church has no hold, other than political and hereditary, on the affections of the great body of its own members. The Irish clergy, though recruited from the same rank in society as their English brethren, and with a very much smaller proportion of resident gentry to overshadow their importance, do not enjoy, on professional grounds, any thing like the same social consideration or respect from their co-religionists. What is more, Dissent of the laxer, and also of the more excitable, kind is spreading fast amongst the middle classes throughout the country; and, in particular, the Anabaptists and Plymouth Brethren make considerable way. Nor is there any valid reason why they should not, since superior zeal and earnestness, rather than any distinctive teaching, mark them off as different from the mass of their endowed competitors.

The Church of Scotland affords even more remarkable testimony in the same direction. There seems no cause for contesting the fact that at the time of the Revolution which changed the Establishment of that country, a very large proportion indeed, if not a clear majority, of the middle and lower classes, save in the West, was Episcopalian; and there is no doubt at all, that Presbyterianism prevailed only amongst an infinitesimal minority of the higher ranks. After the political change came about, the policy adopted by the Scottish Bishops and clergy was to do away, so far as possible, with all external differences between them and the ministers of the Establishment, in the hope of allaying dis-

like, and avoiding the heavy pressure of the penal laws. Ceremonies were pared away, to the extent of laying aside even the surplice and the Common Prayer; and the result, as any intelligent thinker might have forecasted, was, that the main body of Scottish Churchmen, seeing no plain marks of distinction between their own communion and the Establishment, fell away to that which presented the greatest temporal advantages; so that the repeal of the penal laws, unlike the similar measure in Ireland, found the oppressed body in a much weaker condition than it had been in at the date of the enactment. The same short-sightedness still unhappily marks the spiritual rulers of the Scottish Church; and at a time when Presbyterianism is evidently breaking up from its old moorings, and drifting away into unknown seas, they stifle the natural expression of the devotional life of their liturgical Church, and deter converts at the same time that they lawlessly oppress their own flocks.

It is needless to dwell on the pitiful history of respectable Anglican missions to the heathen, or on the more boastful, but not more useful efforts of the sects. The names of India and New Zealand are enough to exhaust the one subject; and that of Jamaica will suffice for the other. In every case, a purely subjective religion, fatally weighted with the most anti-missionary and anti-Christian of dogmas—the Lutheran doctrine of Justification—has been offered to men who needed to be taught by externals to rise gradually into the conception of spiritual life; and with rejection of these externals, came too often practical disbelief in the verities they are meant to typify.

It may, however, be urged against these examples, that they do not afford exact parallels to the case now under consideration. Perhaps a contrast still nearer home will satisfy objectors. Several London clergymen have petitioned lately for the suppression of Ritualism. How stands the matter in their parishes? He would be a bold adventurer in the field of hazardous conjecture who should assert that the Church of England does more than feebly hold her ground in S. Martin's in the Fields, in S. Mary-le-bone, or in the Canonries of Westminster. He would be a bolder contravener of established statistics who should allege that she is not rapidly giving way to Romanism and Dissent in Kensington and Islington, under the system of spiritual starvation in those regions. And of S. George's, Hanover Square, it is enough to remark that the Rector's zeal against ceremonies has taken the practical form of a prohibitory tax of five shillings on registration of Baptisms, which are thus most successfully dis-

couraged amongst the poor, at the trifling cost of violation of all ecclesiastical law.

Any one who chooses to bring the whole Ritual question to a simple test, may do so effectually thus:—Take two street-Arabs, perfectly ignorant of Christianity. Read to one of them the Gospel narrative of the Passion, and comment on it as plainly as may be. Show the other a crucifix, and tell him simply what it means. Question each a week afterwards, and see which has the clearer notions about the history of Calvary. And in the matters of dealing with children, and with the ignorant, who are children in mind, the whole matter may be fitly summed up in the words of a popular writer who is no friend to Tractarians. In *Yeast* we read:—

"It is by pictures and music, by art and song, and symbolic representations, that all nations have been educated in their adolescence; and as the youth of the individual is exactly analogous to the youth of the collective race, we should employ the same means of instruction with our children which succeeded in the early ages with the whole world."

RICHARD FREDERICK LITTLEDALE.

Infanticide: its Cause and Cure.

Dr. Lankester has been sounding in the ears of the public, for many years, his warnings on the terrible increase of child-murder. And as in this country little notice is taken of evils previously little remarked on, we are justified in expecting that now, at length, something practical will be done, seeing that public attention is fully awakened. It is not for me, as an essayist, to say what that something ought to be. It is sufficient if I shall be enabled to suggest a few lines of thought which may assist in making that something less vague than would certainly be the case if the legislature were called on to affix higher penalties to certain accessories of the crime than the judges can now, or at least do now, affix, or if private remedies were to be sought to be applied which might only aggravate the disease which is the most fruitful cause of this hideous sin.

Theologically considered, it is quite impossible to dissociate cruelty, which is the immediate cause of this species of murder, from the vice which nurses it. There is a subtle connexion between lust and cruelty which no metaphysical inquiry can satisfactorily explain. Milton spoke as a theologian when he placed the temple of Chemosh close to that of Moloch:—

> "Yet thence his lustful orgies he enlarged
> Ev'n to that hill of scandal, by the grove
> Of Moloch, homicide—lust hard by hate."

How come the two passions to be so closely connected? The theologian will tell you, that no passion indulged so effectually shuts out the vision of God, as does lust. The moment man sinned he became ashamed. The master passion immediately declared its dominance. I cannot pursue this subject, which opens up a great many difficult problems. I may only remark, before I proceed, that our Lord's birth was the precise opposite of this. His Mother, a pure Virgin, even in thought untainted—there was the most entire absence of that feeling which causes the mournful complaint of the Psalmist, and which may be repeated by every other child of man, "in sin hath my mother conceived me." Unchecked lust, then, by hiding the vision of God, gives us over, body and soul, to the power of the devil—of him who "was a

murderer from the beginning." Hence the crime of murder never fails to attend closely upon lust. A variety of circumstances may, in our composite state of society, intervene to stop the plague, and to prevent lust from going on to its moral result, hatred and murder. But, morally, the two stand to each other as cause and effect.

Socially we admit this, because we have experience of the fact. But in estimating the power of the disease, we do not fairly consider the cause of it, and hence our proposed remedies, in many cases, fall far short of the evil they are designed to meet. Thus men say, "We cannot attack directly the hideous vices which lie at the root of these foul murders, but we can attempt to stop the murders themselves, by removing the more powerful causes which lead to their commission." But when it is inquired into, what are these means? Foundling Hospitals, where mothers, without exposing themselves to the chance of recognition and disgrace, may have their offspring religiously brought up and well cared for. But has experience confirmed this hope? It is indeed quite true that there may be, and possibly are, fewer cases of strangulation where a Foundling Hospital exists in the next street, in which such children are taken charge of. But in what condition are they put into the box, where such institutions are found? Dr. T. K. Chambers has recently told us, that at Genoa, out of 699 so "exposed" in a single year, 333 were either taken out of the box dead, or in such a spent condition that they never recovered, and died off within the first year. Ford, in his "Gatherings in Spain," describes the *Cuna* in Seville as little better than a charnel-house, though in his Guide Book he tells us that, having been taken under the charge of the *Sœurs de Charité*, it is now very admirably managed. I think it is Kohl who gives a very dreadful account of the mortality of children in the similar hospital at St. Petersburg. While in Rome, where as many as 3000 of these unfortunates are annually received, it is reckoned that 72 per cent. die, greatly owing to bad treatment doubtless, superadded to the hardships they have had to endure from their unnatural mothers. The deaths in Paris are said to amount to 18 per cent.

It is, in fact, found that in providing for secresy, you have at the same time tended to encourage the disposition to be secret, with the certain consequence—additional risk to the child during gestation and at the time of birth. I am not disposed to go into the question of the amount of moral crime involved in concealment such as I have spoken of, nor to contrast it with that of which a mother is guilty who, at the time of the birth, from wilful

neglect, causes the death of her child. GOD alone can affix the amount of criminality. Our judges and juries evidently consider it small, if we are to draw our conclusions from the lenient verdicts and absurdly lenient sentences too frequently returned and affixed to this heinous offence.

Nor, again, can we any of us say what effect familiarity with hospitals of this nature might have upon a population such as ours. Visibly, religion has less hold upon the lower classes among us than upon any lower class on the Continent, if we except some parts of Germany, where the population is much less dense, and the danger therefore not so great. There can, I think, be no doubt that the idea of the possibility of concealment, with which people are familiarized, must prove an incentive to vice. I am well aware, at the same time, when temptation has been allowed to get a certain hold on the will, that as nothing deterrent will restrain the person, so neither will any thing in the shape of a further incentive add any weight. But I am speaking of the ordinary feelings and ways of looking at things when temptation is not present. These ideas either aid morality, or sap its foundations; and I am strongly inclined to believe that familiarity with the idea of Foundling Hospitals is not healthy. They suggest concealment and impunity for grave moral sins; and this I think must be hurtful to morality. You cannot associate the minds of people with that which is low or mean without their being seriously injured thereby.

Nor, to look at the matter in the light of parental duty, can their effect be good. One great reason with people for sending their children to school, is to get them out of the way. This is one great cause of the popularity of schools held on Sundays. The people wish for ease and relaxation, and they gladly send their children where they will be looked after without trouble or expense to themselves. Dissenters have availed themselves of this weakness, and have profited thereby. The clergy generally have looked askance at these schools, and with reason. Any thing that relaxes the parental sense of responsibility, is bad. And what of these hospitals? They undertake to relieve the parent of her natural and providential responsibilities altogether, and they charge her—for it is the woman's part I am speaking of—nothing for their trouble. Thus the responsible people are encouraged to shuffle off their responsibilities in a way most prejudicial to all the parties concerned.

In treating the matter socially, I cannot enlarge as I should wish, on the spiritual effects of this course. Pardon is promised to those who repent and confess their sin. It is needless to say

that she who has been secret in all other parts of her conduct will scarcely be open even in the confessional. She has concealed the matter from her fellows, shall she be open with GOD ? The class who can murder or expose their infants, I will not believe to be very scrupulous in confession. For them there should be every thing to encourage openness. But I have said that these houses encourage secresy, and thus have a bad religious effect upon a half penitent.

I by no means go the length of asserting that there should not be houses for the reception of these children under certain conditions ; such as do not prominently imply either secresy or the getting rid of parental responsibility, might be beneficially established. As things are, a mother is sometimes driven, under the pressure of our laws, to desperation. She is unable to work whilst the child is to be nursed. She would willingly allow something out of her wages to support her child, if she could be left free to seek employment. Again, I should be inclined to forcibly take a child from a hopelessly vicious mother—her inability to do justice to her child's education being first proved before an ordinary justice of peace. And again, in cases of marriage with one other than the father of the child, I should allow the mother, after due application, to send her child to such an institution, on engaging to do all she could for its support. In other words, I should be inclined to assist and encourage parental feeling, and not to supersede it—to foster repentance, and not to quench it : to shield her who has confessed her fault, and not to encourage duplicity and deceit.

Publicly, as much care is taken in France to preserve the parental feeling as any where. The abandonment of a child is, in many places, a public act. The mother has to procure a certificate from a Commissary of Police, which he cannot refuse; though he is bound to expostulate, and to endeavour to induce the mother to abandon the intention, and to procure for her assistance from the hospital, in case of his words being successful. Upon production of this certificate the child must be received into the hospital of *Enfants Assistés*. At any time the child may be reclaimed. In 1832 the *tours*, or turning-boxes by which the child might be deposited in secret, were abolished. After a twenty years' trial, however, the *tours* were restored in Paris, and in some of the Departments. In 1832 there were in France 296 such hospitals. The number now is only 152. Infanticide has increased, it is said, whilst other crimes have steadily declined ; but it does not appear whether this increase is to be attributed to the decrease of hospitals, or to the abandon-

ment of secresy, nor has there been time yet to ascertain the result in those localities where the use of the *tour* has been resumed.

It is greatly to be feared that increase of wealth and luxury in France may have had as much to do with the additional profligacy as any greater stringency in regard to publicity has had to do with child-murder or abortion. At any rate, a country which is altering its rules in this matter is not to be compared with one where the system has never been tried on any great scale. Any change will certainly be felt, though it will be some time before the effect will be fully seen, because the ideas of a people are only slowly changed. There can be no doubt that a gradual increase of murders would be the result of a sudden stoppage put to the French system, up to a certain point. After that they would probably decline, and would stand at an average not perhaps very greatly different from what is now the case. The number of such children maintained in the Paris Hospital amounts to an average of between 4000 and 5000.

In England we never have had any great national hospitals for this class of inmates. The Foundling Hospital in Guilford-street was founded by the efforts of one man—Captain Thomas Coram, master of an American merchantman. It is now a wealthy charity, maintaining about as many hundreds as the Paris Hospital does thousands. There is an air of respectability, too, about it, which seems to me rather out of place in an institution of the kind. The committee sit upon each case that is recommended. The child must be a first one, no second unfortunate being admissible. Thus the hospital is limited to the more respectable of those who have fallen, and does not profess to step in to rescue those children who are more likely to be murdered—the issue of the more abandoned. Nor does it seem that any expostulation is made with the mother, as is done in France, to induce her to nurse her own child, nor is any assistance given her to enable her to do so.

In fact, there cannot be a doubt that English feeling is against foundling hospitals, partly from the fear of seeming to connive at, if not to give encouragement to, crime; partly because of our domesticity, which would much rather trust a child to the mercies of a paid nurse and a private house than to a public charity. Only, if hospitals are to be established here, it would be well to have them under the regulations I have described as existing, at one time universally, in those of France, and still extensively prevailing. In fact, if France had had to begin instead of having had to alter, I do not doubt some such regulations would have still been universal there.

It is commonly held that the fear of shame and of loss of caste usually operates more than any thing else to drive a mother to murder her illegitimate offspring. Doubtless, to some extent, this is the case, though not to the degree supposed. The woman suffers, the man goes free; her character is blasted, his is nearly untarnished. I have no intention whatever of indulging in the somewhat romantic enthusiasm of some persons who decry the man and bestow all their pity upon the woman. There are two wills in the case, and a virtuous woman's is at least as strong as that of any ordinary man. I am inclined to think, too, from many facts that have come before me, that the temptation quite as frequently commences with the woman as with the man. However, without attempting nicely to balance the amount of blame, it is quite certain that the degree of punishment is most unequally balanced. It would certainly seem that the two persons are fairly, though not equally, chargeable with concealment. If the man knows that a woman is *enceinte* by him, and fails to provide accommodation for the lying-in, and for the prospective maintenance of the child, he most assuredly fails in his duty, and his offence ought to be punishable by the judge. Should the child be injured in the birth for want of accommodation or necessary aid, he is certainly passively culpable, and ought to be so treated. Some such law would prove to be a wholesome restraint upon many who now take advantage of their immunity from punishment.

Again, a man should certainly know that he will be assessed for maintenance, not according to the position of the mother, but according to his own means. This is the Mahommedan *law*, which is in this respect more just than Christian *custom* in this matter. The child ought certainly to take rank from the father, not from the mother. If it should be objected that many women would be found to trade upon this provision to better their temporal estate, I add that this would be more than counterbalanced by the greater degree of prudence and self-restraint which such an enactment would generate amongst men in general.

And again, why should the burden of proof of affiliation be left to the woman? The trial to her feelings, thus roughly harrowed by having to go before a body of men to prove her own shame, causes many a women to bear the burthen in secret, or, as it too frequently happens, to put the child out of the way altogether. Let the parish institute the inquiry, and have power to punish the man, on proof, who would evade his responsibilities.

Do what we will, there must still remain the natural inequality which GOD has Himself for wise purposes established between the case of the woman and that of the man. Society will ever make the woman the chief sufferer, that we need not fear, in addition to the natural punishment inflicted upon her by Almighty GOD Himself for the loss of a woman's chief graces—virtue and modesty.

To such an extent as this, both private benevolence and the law may come in to prevent lust going on to its near neighbour —murder. But until the crime of infanticide is punished as rigorously as other kinds of murders, I see little hope of any effectual stop being put to it. I feel convinced that the horrible scandal and sin of such places for wholesale murder as has been recently exposed at Torquay, and which we are told exist in many other towns, is chargeable, in great measure, to the criminal laxity of the authorities in punishing ordinary cases of infanticide. All sorts of trivial excuses are allowed to be pleaded. Because some women are at such times incapable of acting as responsible beings, therefore, without one tittle of evidence to support such a plea in a special case, a jury are easily persuaded that it might be so in the instance before them, and the woman is let go. Thus, bundles are left lying about the streets, which people will not touch, lest the too familiar object—a dead body—should be revealed, perchance with a pitch-plaster over its mouth, or a woman's garter round its throat. Thus, too, the metropolitan canal boats are impeded, as they are tracked along, by the number of drowned infants with which they come in contact, and the land is becoming defiled by the blood of her innocents. We are told by Dr. Lankester that there are 12,000 women in London to whom the crime of child-murder may be attributed: In other words, that one in every thirty women (I presume between fifteen and forty-five) is a murderess.

It is not requisite, whatever may be said to the contrary, to have recourse to legislation to meet such cases as these. But there must be some reason for the great unwillingness of juries to convict for murder, indeed, for the judges charging them to convict on the second plea of concealment. Why is it that feminine frailty pleads so powerfully with men? Why is it that they let go the woman, when a man guilty of murdering his infant child would certainly have to answer with his life? There must be some way of accounting for it; and though I may not actually state the right reason, I will venture to suggest a few reflections which others may follow up.

I may say then—fully remembering how He, the only Man

Who was perfect in purity, dealt with the adulteress—that men are conscious of their own infirmities. Their reluctance to punish a crime which has its origin in what they consider feminine weakness and pliability, is too often a reflection on their own experience. They do not know the strength of a virtuous woman in the lower walks of life. Their views are perverted by their own actions. They know that if they were to be rigorously dealt with they could not escape; and so, in place of casting the first stone, they one by one decline the duty altogether.

If a married woman murders her legitimate offspring, or if a hardened and abandoned woman does the same, there is no mercy. It is on the servant-girl class, or the poor sempstress, that all this tender pity and misplaced indulgence are lavished.

With this is associated the further feeling of comparative disregard for the child killed. There are a great many chances that a child of such parentage will ultimately go to swell the dangerous class of the population. The case is not one which appeals strongly to their feelings.

Again, it is felt that the laws of the land bear harshly on the female offender against purity. Therefore, however wrong it may be, men seek in their verdicts to equalize matters, no doubt quite unconsciously. The only remedy for this seems to lie in punishing both persons, if it be shown that the man had fair warning of the woman's state, aided her in concealment, and neglected to make provision for the expected infant.

Nor is it perhaps altogether wide of the mark to suggest another cause. The worship of intellectual ability and of physical strength have, among other causes, led us to rate a man's life above its real value. It is said to be the worst use you can put a man to, to hang him. This platitude has its weight amongst those who oppose capital punishments. But it is only "man" of whom this is said, though "woman" is doubtless implied. But every one feels if we substitute "child" the saying loses half its force. Out of a man we can get so much work, either physical or mental; he is a unit in our social state. But we never idolize a false maxim without necessarily degrading some nearly connected truth. There is no doubt that the sympathies of the money-making world are not with children—i. e., not with other people's children. It is one symptom of our growing hardness. Hence, the dreadful frequency of the crime of infanticide is passed by with a hasty remark by those persons who could not rest in their beds, if no attempt were made to discover the murderer of a full-grown man.

The result of these things together is, that children are put

out of the way daily, without the circumstance causing us a second thought; whilst the rapid decline of parental authority leaves sons and daughters much more at liberty to follow their unrestrained courses, which tend to swell the general mass of immorality, out of which infant murder as surely crops as the native rock from the rugged mountain-top. I have not alluded, except incidentally, to the earlier stages of this crime—to those dreadful places to be found in perhaps, I may say, all our large towns, where means to procure abortion are had recourse to, down to those easier means of destroying the embryo which unfortunately are so well known, even among very young women, in the earlier stages of pregnancy. These are all crimes of the same kind, and only differ in degree from that of which I have mainly hitherto spoken. There is destruction of the life of the germinating seed of a living soul, and it is only the less cruel that the being has not been seen, and therefore there has been no means of calling forth that yearning towards their offspring which even the lower animals share with human creatures. Medical men are well aware of numerous cases of this kind; only these are among professional secrets which it might not be advisable to oblige them to divulge. But certainly where a case does occur, and where the evidence is sufficient to procure conviction, the offence ought to be dealt with as amongst the most grave of those punishable by the criminal law. The streams of infant blood now crying out against this land will never be stanched, till the blood of those by whom it has been shed has paid the penalty.

That these methods will cure the evil, no one can suppose. We can only hope, through the help of the law, to bring the public mind into a more healthy state in reference to the crime of infanticide. But after all, repression, as we all know, is of only temporary effect. *Quid leges sine moribus vanæ proficiunt?* A people deeply sunk in sin will never endure the law's severity; and this, as we have already said, is one, if not the main cause, of the disinclination to enforce the rigour of the law in the instance of infanticide. To give such severity the slightest chance of success, remedial measures must go hand in hand with the inflexibility of the judicature.

It is an old observation, that the schoolmaster does more for the morality of a bad district than the policeman; though, to be sure, the parliament does not seem to think so, who spend millions on prisons and police, and grudge hundreds of thousands to schoolmasters and schools. And if a school does much, a church must do more. Here is not only the machinery for preventing sin, but the means, too, of atoning for sin committed. Here con-

science is purified, and its dictates taught to be listened to as the voice of God. And this, after all, must be our hope. With lawless lust, relentless cruelty is always associated; and the only way to stop the one is to attack the other in its fastnesses. If the garrison, however, is to be properly manned hereafter, we must have soldiers ready to defend the walls. It is not enough to cast out the foe, we must have a friend prepared for all emergencies; and this all the prisons and jailors, all the police magistrates and home secretaries cannot do for us. It can be done by the priest and by none other. Hence the surest method to cure infanticide lies in that which seems, at first sight, very remote—the planting of clergymen and the building of churches. You may try all other schemes, this alone will in the end be really efficacious.

And here the uncomfortable feeling will come in—"why nothing, as experience has proved, is so very liable to abuse as religion; the world is ever the worse for bad priests." To be sure, bad priests are very bad; no others so degraded, so demoralized, and in their influence so demoralizing. That is true; and yet, in the main, the world is assuredly very much the better for the Christian clergy. In this country there ought to be no question about this; and the position of the priesthood all over Christendom is a proof that, on the whole, such is the general estimate of their value. If the world requires mending in its morals, they are the accredited order to accomplish the work; and if they cannot do it, we may be quite sure the work cannot be done. Nothing, it is true, in this world is permanent; and a reformation, by whomsoever organized, in the course of a generation or two, will certainly require again looking to. But because human things are mutable, is that any reason why men should do nothing? People do not cease washing themselves because a day's toil will make them require washing again. GOD cares for men in proportion as they care for Him; and if He has appointed a machinery for the moral defects of the world, we shall never gain His blessing by despising it.

At any rate, the root of the common infanticide which we deplore is in the low moral condition of our people. That no one who knows any thing about it will deny. There are cases of infanticide which do not come under this category—cases of jealousy, of fear of starvation, of ten thousand other ills that flesh is heir to. These may be mitigated to a very considerable degree by the means I have spoken of. But what I contend is, that the crime of infanticide is exceptionally high, and that by a strictly moral and religious education it may be brought very

much lower. I do not think much of averages, because nothing is so variable. As merely exhibiting the actual state of things at the time of the average being struck for the period over which it extends, of course these figures have their use. But when out of these we try to extract an invariable law, the folly of the thing is so obvious in the statement, that one is surprised that the perverse ingenuity of men should have sought to construct an argument in favour of Deism out of any thing so baseless.

But we have to deal with a very high average; and the question is, how is it to be dealt with? As I have said, religious education and religious practice are the only sure grounds of virtue; and unfailing severity, where crime is proved, is the only way of keeping the public mind right on the subject, and of making men understand its enormity. But I have now to say something of the curative process needful to be pursued, and indeed already in action—to nothing like the extent necessary, however, for a disease so wide-spread and so dangerous. In considering this question there are several points to be observed. The descent into sin is gradual, and in most cases arises from the defects of family management. There are—1. Idle and vagabond children, of whom we instinctively observe that they are bringing up for a life of infamy. 2. There are those where the parents are not only idle and vicious themselves, but who would gladly bring their children up to a life of vice, if they might share in the profit resulting from it. 3. There are those who, from necessity or other cause, are obliged to abandon home before virtuous habits are confirmed. 4. There are others whose special business throws them in the way of temptation. 5. There are those betrayed into sin by designing villains, or by those who, equally unsuspecting with themselves, are "overtaken" by powerful temptation from unguardedness. 6. There are the openly vicious. Now for these six classes it is apparent that different treatment is required, and, in some cases at least, different institutions. For the first and second we require Orphanages and Juvenile Reformatories, according to the extent to which those classes have fallen into actual crime. For the third, Religious Guilds. For the fourth, lodgings presided over by Religious. For the fifth, Retreats; and for the sixth, Penitentiaries.

I feel that, in most of these cases, there has been undue preference shown for one or other of the sexes. Thus Reformatories are mostly for boys, Orphanages for girls, Religious Lodging-houses for young women, and Retreats and Penitentiaries for the same sex. Why should it be so? We are stumbling gradually into something like a systematic way of grappling with

vice, most of our ways, as was natural, having hitherto been rather hap-hazard. But why should young women, who are early called away from home, be supposed to be more exposed to temptation than young men similarly circumstanced? Why should there be institutions for reclaiming young women, and none for reclaiming the fallen shop-boy or apprentice? Many a parent, whose efforts to save a headstrong son from sin have proved futile, would very gladly indeed send him to a Penitentiary, to be placed under a regular course of discipline; and many a youth, disgusted with himself and his vicious companions, would willingly take shelter in a Refuge, did one exist, to aid him in conquering himself. Many a girl, too, who has incurred the reproach of lost virtue under palliating circumstances, would go into a Retreat, who would yet shrink from the idea of a Penitentiary where she would be herded with the sweepings of the *pavé*. After all, there will be many cases which we cannot reach—profligate men, who bring all their vile experience to entrap poor unsuspecting girls, and *blasées* women who lay themselves out to win the admiration of young men just appearing in the world, and for whose special convenience those places for procuring abortion seem to have been established. These people live in a class of society which is not "dangerous" in the sense of the world; but among them, we verily believe, there is more positive cruelty, in proportion to their numbers—more fear of their dealing foully by their offspring, than amongst any other class whatever. It would be a real benefit to the world if some of these could be brought under the operation of the law. A Newgate execution done upon such odious wretches would effect more for the cause of morality than twenty executions of wretched servant-girls, who murder their children for fear of loss of character, and consequent loss of place and means of livelihood.

I am glad to know that Guilds are now being established in the manufacturing districts for the protection of female virtue. These are very simply worked by distribution into classes; each class-leader having to report any instance of undue levity to the head of the Guild, among those of her class. The Guild medal is worn exposed, and a short form of prayer daily is of obligation among the members.

And this leads me to say that one of the greatest difficulties is with our country population. Farming morality is very low; and efforts to raise the tone which are possible in towns, are clearly beyond our reach in the country. More depends upon our being able to influence the farmers and their families here, than any direct measures which we can bring to bear. The farmer who looks

after his men, the good wife who looks after the women, and the young ladies who will teach the agricultural labourers' children their catechism, and see that they are sent to church and school, will do more than a whole colony of sisters. One great hindrance is the extremely vagabond character of the agricultural labourer in many parts of the country. It has become the custom only to hire for the year, and at the end of that time the whole family moves to some other neighbourhood. Thus the children grow up without local attachment, and their education suffers by irregularity of school attendance and change of master and of system. I am quite prepared to say that sisterhoods would be well employed in offering a good education, "with the accomplishments," to farmers' daughters in central positions in the agricultural districts. Their efforts in this way will be much more likely to affect the whole population than if they attempted directly to bring their influence to bear on the labouring population or domestic servants. Farmers' daughters are looking up. Where this is the case, there is ever a vast amount of pretentiousness. Let the sisters deepen whilst they refine, which the boarding-schools of the day do not attempt to do. If the daughters of the farmhouse can teach their poorer sisters to be purer in their language when mixed with the men, they will have effected unspeakable good. Any thing more gross and filthy is not to be heard in the civilized world. The habitual employment of such language breaks down all notion of reserve or modesty, and the ideas it represents defile the mind and ruin the virtue.

Perhaps there is no work in which a religious brotherhood might more profitably occupy its members than in itinerating among the farms in any special district, giving short popular services in any barn or granary which might be lent to them, and thus getting at the people. This might be followed up with night-schools during the winter, two or three times a week, and in the summer in encouraging games and active sports. Your agricultural labourer is as inactive in body as he is in mind; and prefers hanging about the haylofts and stables, getting into mischief, to running after a cricket-ball, or handling a bat. No people make so little of the resources of the country as those of this class who constantly inhabit it. I have watched frequently the vagaries of town boys turned out for a month into the country to enjoy themselves. Within a week they have become the leaders of country boys in all country sports—fishing, bathing, boating, bird-nesting, trapping, shooting, running, leaping, hunting, cricketing, bowling, kite-flying. No one can

say what temptations such ways of employing themselves enable boys to escape. And there is a class of women about farms whom it is specially needful to keep boys away from. These are female servants approaching middle life, grown up in sin, whom the men thoroughly know and avoid, and who therefore seek their prey amongst herd-boys and plough-boys. Good, manly, healthy habits, after religion, are the best security against such temptations as these.

As regards the farmers themselves, so far as they fall under the class of gentlemen, they will have the education and will be subjected to the influences of their class. The richer farmers of a lower social grade are, in many respects, the most important portion of the body. They are generally men of energy, and are every where looked up to among the agricultural population. I should like to see agricultural colleges multiplied for their benefit. For the great mass of the smaller farmers, who now send their sons to be taught arithmetic and grammar at some cheap boarding-school in a neighbouring town, I should like to see special schools more generally established. I feel assured they would pay well. S. John's, Hurstpierpoint, proves what I say, though what I should like are schools not aiming so high as it does, but content to do better what the cheap boarding-schools in towns now do badly. Farmers are, as a body, Churchmen; but they have great faults which require careful eradication. When we consider what large numbers of people in the aggregate depend upon them, we can scarcely exaggerate the importance of having them well and religiously taught.

But there are still two classes left, whom I must not omit, whose temptations are peculiar, and who contribute a greater quota to the vice of the population than any others; these are sailors and soldiers. Their lives are passed, for the most part, in enforced celibacy. Among soldiers a very small proportion indeed can be married men; and amongst sailors the much larger portion of their time is spent at sea, and away from home. Now these are dangerous positions for any considerable classes of men to occupy. For those who have no special vocation, such trials are fraught with danger the most imminent. The consequence is, in both cases, temporary connexions formed in the towns they arrive at in the fulfilment of their duties, and a great demoralization. In some cases families result from these temporary connexions, and their condition is pitiable indeed. So far as the families themselves, and the mothers are concerned, they have been treated under one or other of my former heads, but the fathers require separate consideration.

So far as soldiers are concerned, the existing attempts to win them to more virtuous ways have been strict canteen regulations, and the endeavour to make their quarters more attractive. Wherever these have been carried out systematically by right principled officers, the results have been most encouraging. The defect seems to be that these matters are left too much to the discretion of officers, a considerable proportion of whom, in place of setting their men a good example, are the leaders in all sorts of offences against the moral code. The difference of a regiment under a good colonel and inferior officers, from one under a graceless one, is so marked as to be apparent to the mere eye. The Government might do more to equalize this difference than is now done, and the garrison chaplains must do the rest. These last should be encouraged to send annual reports of the condition of the several regiments to the Chaplain-General, and his reports to the Government ought to be received with the most considerate attention. Neither officers nor men ought to be spared upon a representation from the Chaplain-General. Meanwhile the chaplain ought to have more real power than he possesses at present to check abuses, and to improve the morals of the men. In his own place his power ought to be absolute, so as to enable him to avail himself of those wills which have been, by military discipline, brought into a favourable condition for him to work on.

The present appliances for improving the morals of sailors are Homes and Ship-churches. Theirs is confessedly the most difficult case to meet, in fact we can only hope to mitigate the evils of it. The sailor is naturally improvident, yet he is naturally religious too. He is a spendthrift, yet he is generous and open-hearted. The unnatural confinement of a long voyage naturally disposes him to excess *en revanche.* When he comes ashore, he is waylaid by panderers and loose women, who never let him go till they have taken from him every halfpenny he possesses. Sailors' Homes have done something to protect him against these harpies; but to meet the case adequately, these institutions would have to be multiplied by thousands. It is of little use to protect the sailor in London, and to leave him a prey to his natural enemies in Hamburg or in Lisbon. Measures ought to be concerted with foreign merchants, or foreign Governments, for the erection of similar institutions in all their principal ports.

These places ought to form the nuclei of all direct religious attempts. A certain number of chaplains, according to the size of the port, ought to be put in charge of the Homes. In addition to their shore duties, there would be those of visiting vessels in

harbour, and bringing this floating population, as near as may be, into the condition of parishes on land. If the Homes were managed with discretion, every sailor lodged in them would become a valuable aid to the chaplain amongst the rest of the sailor world. When one thinks of Grotius writing his *De Veritate* specially for sailors, one is driven to believe that Dutch sailors are very different from those of Great Britain, or that there has been a sad deterioration since his day in the class. Our efforts to reclaim them have been to the last degree fragmentary and insufficient; and till we can improve their condition, that vile female population, which is the scandal of our civilization, will abound in our ports, spreading the contagion of their horrible vices far and wide over the land.

I have not said any thing here of Governmental interference to mitigate the scandals existing in our large towns. This belongs to another branch of this wide subject. The persons who constitute the class do not, as a rule, contribute greatly to swell the population, except under the conditions of such a temporary connexion as those to which I have just alluded. But their existence, in the present unchecked condition under which they ply their disgraceful trade, does undoubtedly ruin the morality of many with whom they come in contact, and who do not follow them in the same excess of riot. Thus, if they do not themselves contribute largely to the class of child-murderers, they do tend to create such a class. I will here merely give the regulations in this matter in Paris, and which seem to me wise, and capable of being adopted, in part at least, in this country. When a girl is seen loitering about the streets, she is asked her name and address by some one of a numerous society which exists for the suppression of profligacy. She is reported to the police, and at the same time the person is bound to wait upon the parents and employers, if any, to apprise them of the circumstance. A lady, meantime, warns and persuades the girl. If the girl is still seen to be unmoved, she is for the second offence taken by the police before the neighbouring magistrate, and by him told what awaits her. If she is still idle, and obviously going wrong, though not yet fallen, she is asked the third time whether she is willing to strive to live honestly, or to have her name inscribed at once in the register of infamy. A fortnight is allowed for consideration, during which time every effort is made to induce her to abandon her dissolute courses. If, after that, she continues as before, her name is inscribed among the list of the licentious, and she is thenceforth under police surveillance, and is prevented walking abroad to solicit prostitution. The law of France ex-

pressly prohibits the occupation of a house devoted to this scandalous purpose within a certain distance of either a school or church. Thus though, as we all know, vice exists to a fearful extent in Paris, people have to go in search of it. It does not obtrude itself on the notice, and young men are not tempted, as frequently in England, by the glittering exterior, the made-up charms, and the forced gaiety of these miserable children of sin. It is not, in Paris, thought manly for boys to accost these lost creatures in the street. If vice exists, at any rate it hides its shame.

The objection to some of these provisions will of course be, that they seem to protect vice by regulating it. But so far as they are penal, this objection does not apply. We have made it a matter of police regulation that these women shall not solicit; and it seems to me that no solid objection can be raised against further legislation in the same line.

It has been my endeavour, to show that no partial legislation, no desultory efforts, will avail to decrease this fearful crime of infanticide, which is deluging our country with infant blood, and calling down the wrath of Heaven upon it. Blood must be washed out by blood, and the laws must be inflexibly administered. But that, after all, this is but the symptom of a disease much more wide-spread; it is but the poisonous fruit of a tree whose roots are buried deep in the rank, uncultured soil of the human heart. And as GOD gives the increase to all spiritual graces, so the Evil One as certainly brings murders out of impurity. If, therefore, we are to stop child-murder, we must strive to check that which gives rise to it—unbridled lust.

These methods are threefold—Repression where possible, Cure, Prevention. The first is obviously the duty of Government; the second and third may be undertaken by individuals or societies, aided by Government.

It would appear that Foundling Hospitals, if they do not exercise upon the population a bad effect—as leading people to think it possible and advantageous to conceal the consequences of immorality, thus inflicting an injury on the children of unlawful intercourse, which is testified to by the comparatively large mortality in these institutions, especially during the first year after their entrance—still they must weaken the sense of parental responsibility, unless placed under very careful regulation, as in France. In this case they cease to be Hospitals of *enfants trouvés*, and become institutions of *enfants assistés*—no longer Foundling Hospitals, but institutions giving aid to mothers to bring up their children aright, and receiving the offspring of utterly demoralized parents, and giving them a better prospect than they other-

wise would have of entering on the duties of life respectably. The partial return of France to the previous system of concealment, does not really affect this country, where Foundling Hospitals in the proper sense do not, and have not, within the memory of the present generation, existed.

There seems to be a degree of unfairness in the way in which our laws and society at large treat the woman. Children ought to take rank from the father, not from the mother, and consequently ought to have assigned for their bringing up a sum proportioned to the father's station in the world. The father ought to be held responsible for concealment, and to be punished if he connives at it. The parish ought to institute the inquiry into the paternity of a base-born child, and to have the power of punishing the man who would evade his responsibilities.

In the way of Prevention and Cure, special appliances through the efforts of the Religious and of Associated Societies have been recommended. I have done little more than take for granted throughout habitual resort to Confession. The high morality of Ireland is owing in great part to this habit; and the low tone of morals in Scotland is, I fear, to be greatly attributed to the impossibility of having recourse to a sacramental ordinance so specially adapted by our most loving LORD to strengthen those who are secretly tempted to sin. It will rest with the clergy every where to recommend the practice, especially to those whom they are preparing for Confirmation.

I do not pretend to have done more in the foregoing remarks than to suggest in a sketchy way certain comprehensive measures which appear adequate to meet a widely prevailing evil. Nor is it conceived that such measures, if forthwith adopted, would have any very immediate effect. Twenty years of steady perseverance might, and doubtless would, strongly affect the public mind and conscience, and would certainly lower the average of a class of offences which are no less awful in the sight of GOD than they are scandalous to us as a nation in the sight of man.

P.S.—Since the above Essay was written, the Report, as prepared for presentation, of the Commission on Capital Punishment, has appeared. A distinction in degrees in murder is proposed to be recognized in our Penal Code. Murders committed under the influence of sudden rage, deep-seated revenge, or insensate jealousy, are to be considered as murder only in secondary degree, and are recommended to be punished by imprisonment. Among the secondary degrees of culpability, rather curiously out of place, we find child-murder reckoned, if the child should be under seven days old! That is to say, a mother

who has had months to think of it, who makes no provision for her coming child, and kills it when born, is to be treated as though she had suddenly and for the first time felt the horror of her situation; and, unable to calmly resolve on any thing, had, in a fit of madness, made away with her offspring. What I complain of in this proposal is the utter want of consideration of the moral obliquity that can override parental feeling, and the very softest and most natural of human instincts. The fact of such a proposal being made is a confession of our failure to get our judges and juries to protect, with adequate verdicts and sentences, the most helpless of our race. I trust this proposal will be well considered, and the reasons on which it is founded sifted by Parliament.

Also, since the above Essay was in type, the first Annual Report of the Home of Compassion, near Iffley, Oxford, has been published. This institution bids fair to be successful, and deservedly so. The principles are the same as have been upheld in the foregoing Essay. I am indeed glad that my suggestions have been anticipated in practice, as the following extract will show:—

"Children were at first admitted indiscriminately, but a very short experience sufficed to show that this would never answer, it being practically little better than a premium to vice; women, who it was afterwards found had ample means of support, presented their children for admittance to save themselves from the expense of keeping them, while others came and left their children, and then went directly and sinned again, thinking they could do so with impunity. To obviate these and like difficulties the cradle was done away with, and it was resolved to admit of three classes of children only, namely, those whose histories showed them to be real objects of Christian charity, and whose mothers seemed earnest in their desire of amendment; secondly, those whose mothers were willing to enter into a Penitentiary and undergo the necessary discipline of the same; and thirdly, such as had mothers who were either in or had the offer of returning to respectable domestic or other service if lightened of their burden. These latter were expected to pay so much a week towards the maintenance of their children, according to their scale of wages, and, in common with those first mentioned, to keep up, as far as possible, a constant correspondence with the sisters; so that their perseverance in a return to a better life may be the one great end kept in view."

The Report speaks of the great mortality, but no figures are given by which to judge of the rate. This might be amended in a future Report. The truth in this case will not permanently injure the charity. Every one is prepared to expect it to be large. At first these institutions in this country will only get the most desperate cases. And the samples that are given show that, but for this institution, many of those now living must, ere this, have been numbered with the dead.

H. HUMBLE.

Cathedral Reform.

"If a man," said Lord Bacon, "shall not by his industry, virtue, and policy, as it were, with an oar row against the stream and inclination of time, all institutions and ordinances, be they never so pure, will corrupt and degenerate;" and he replies to possible objections against this assertion, "they may as well tell me that churches and chapels need no reparations, though castles and houses do, whereas, commonly to speak truth, dilapidations of the inward and spiritual edifications of the Church of God are in all times as great as the outward and material." "Laws not refreshed with new laws, wax sour. Without change of ill, a man cannot continue the good. To take away many abuses supplanteth not good orders, but establisheth them. A contentious retaining of custom is a turbulent thing, as well as innovation. A good husband is ever pruning in his vineyard or his field, not unseasonably not unskilfully, but lightly, he findeth ever somewhat to do." Such are the arguments of this great thinker for the necessity of a continuous reformation, and the laws and conditions on which he recommends that it should proceed. No portion of our Church polity has been subject to such constant change as our Cathedral system—by new statutes during the mediæval period, by the great changes effected at the Reformation, and by more recent Parliamentary legislation. We propose briefly to survey its growth and decline, the successive resuscitation and renewals, and the later measures of spoliation, what has given it prosperity or inflicted injury; whilst with an impartial hand, viewing it as part of the Church of England under all its phases and conditions, we shall describe its varying fortunes, its shortcomings, and its undoubted value.

The Cathedral system was founded on missionary considerations; it afforded a central position for multiplying circuits and establishing new centres for evangelizing whole districts. To this day we have a trace of the fact in the existence of 'cursal' canonries in some Welsh cathedrals, which preserve the names of the 'cylths' or courses, in which the incumbents circulated through the circuits into which the parish of the cathedral was partitioned. But when, in course of time, these circuits became

distinct parishes, with their own churches and endowments, the clergy retained as his council and fellow-labourers in the mother church, became the chapter of the bishop. The cathedral was thus the centre and heart of the diocese; and in it the canons, contrary to the custom of Lotharingia, of Rheims, and of Metz, the nurseries of the system, occupied in England separate houses, arranged as a close, and not, as in a modified monastery, eating in a common refectory, and sharing a single dormitory. It is an observable fact that the attempt at Exeter, York, and Wells to introduce the Lotharingian system of a common refectory and dormitory, which William of Malmesbury brands as un-English, never did take root in this country. They were called secular canons, in contradistinction to the regular canons, who were bound to observe the monastic vow of poverty, and to live cloistered. The Norman bishops introduced a complete and organized system which had taken firm root in the twelfth century. Paris appears to have been the model of S. Paul's, Amiens of Salisbury, and Rouen of Lincoln. S. Patrick's, at Dublin, Dunkeld, and Glasgow adopted the rule of Salisbury; Ross, in Scotland, Dornoch, Elgin, and Aberdeen, that of Lincoln.

The arrangement was simple and exhaustive. There was the bishop, the head of the cathedral; the dean, with the care of morals, and cure of souls within the precinct; the præcentor, charged with the ritual, and the service of sacred song; the chancellor, at once secretary, theological reader, and lecturer in canon law; and the treasurer, whose time was devoted to the care of the fabric, altars, furniture, lights, necessaries for divine offices, and the servants. These principal persons or dignitaries were necessarily to be perpetually resident. To these succeeded the archdeacons, who, in consideration of their diocesan duties, were excused from such restrictions. Besides these was a numerous body of canons and prebendaries; canons, as they were on the church roll, and bound to observe the law of the cathedral, having a stall in choir, and a voice in chapter; and prebendaries, as they were maintained upon its revenues or commune. Towards the close of the tenth, and in the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, this commune was divided into separate prebends, rents of lands, proceeds of churches, or a proportion of the offerings, from which they took their title; such as Greater or Lesser Part of the Altar, Ten pounds, One hundred shillings, Sixty shillings, the Little Mead, Consumed by the Sea; and in some cases the name of the founder was adopted, as prebends were specially founded by such benefactors. To all these the bishop collated, but the dean was elected by the chapter.

It would seem that, simultaneously with this new system, permission of absence was granted to those who taught in schools, to those who were in the service of the Crown, of an archbishop, or of a bishop, to those who were sent upon missions for the benefit of the Church, and to those who would reside on their prebends, serving their churches and looking after the good estate of the property. Such non-residence lasted during three quarters of the year. The dignitaries were in priests' orders; but the stalls of the canons were divided into three classes, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, and a certain number were summoned in four regular courses as the satellites or assistants of the dignitaries, to serve at the high altar for the remaining quarter of the year. In consequence of these absences, the fact that many canons were unable to sing, and to provide in case of illness and decrepitude, but also from the natural tendency of persons in high station to retain deputies, each had his vicar, who was required to be in the same order as his master, and able to chant. These representatives, in the case of the dignitaries, were the sub-dean, succentor, scribe, or vice-chancellor, and sacrist or sub-treasurer. The archdeacons and canons maintained their several vicars at their own charges. As early as the twelfth century, when distinct prebends were founded or constituted, the evil of non-residence prevailed. Canons preferred to be hangers-on in the house of some powerful patron, thus evading the duties and attendance on divine service; or to live at their own will upon the income of their prebend. If absent for only one-third of a year, the canon was held to be a residentiary, and did not provide a vicar. In order to secure a sufficient number of residentiaries, the system of the commune was introduced; the whole surplus revenue of the cathedral to which each non-residentiary contributed, after making provision for the fabric and necessaries of divine worship, was divided among the residents, in proportion to the number of their attendances, as the quotidian or daily pay; and again, the fines levied on their occasional remissness, called the residue, were distributed to the more deserving and punctual.

But the evil was never entirely healed. In the fourteenth century it was augmented by the growth of pluralities, and the collation of foreigners to stalls; at the same time a tax so heavy was laid upon the new residentiary as to amount to a prohibition. In the first place he received no income during his first year, and was bound to entertain a certain number of the inferior ministers daily, some of whom rendered him domestic service *familiare obsequium*, and to show hospitality to members of the chapter and strangers; whilst his first expenses on admission

amounted to the gift, at least, of a cope or twenty marks, and a palfrey or ten marks. In some cathedrals fifty; one or two hundred marks were paid towards the fabric; at York one thousand marks; at S. Paul's between seven hundred and a thousand; in others it was indispensable that he should possess 40*l.* a year in clear income of personal property. It may be observed that two hundred marks at S. Paul's had been prescribed by Pope Martin. Even so late as the time of Elizabeth, a new residentiary at Hereford had to pay 10*l.* and forty marks, and provide a table during forty days, commuted in 1636 to 50*l.* At S. Paul's he, during one year, entertained two minor canons, four vicars, two choristers, vergers, and bell-ringers, and every morning two attendant canons; besides giving a quarterly dinner to the canons, and two grand feasts to the bishop, canons, lord mayor, and corporation, followed by an entertainment to the whole choir. At Exeter he paid 40*l.*; at Lichfield one hundred marks. At Salisbury he paid 40*s.* to each canon, gave entertainments to the bishop during forty, to the dean for thirty, and to each canon twenty days; in 1428 the fine was raised to 71*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, and in case of dignitaries to 105*l.* At Chichester he entertained, during a year, his vicar, two other vicars, the porter, two sacrists and one chorister, besides entertainments to the dean and chapter, and hospitality to strangers of Sussex visiting the cathedral. When he became entitled to remuneration he received a house usually belonging to the bishop, or in his gift; 20*l.*, or less, to 25*l.* as his share in the commune during the whole year in quarterly dividends; a quotidian, called sometimes mass pennies, varying from 4*d.* to 1*s.* a day as quotidian for attendance in choir; an allowance of bread and ale or wine, or a payment in commutation and a share in the distribution of fines, fees on festivals, obits and offerings, perhaps about £20 on an average. The dignitaries, however, received additional rations and income.

The attendance in choir was usually, in later times, limited to presence at high mass or one hour daily; in some cases to mass and one of the hours. A prebendary merely gave notice to the dean, or senior residentiary, that he would appear on a certain day and protest residence, and was then admitted to be *stagiarius, stationarius,* or residentiary for life; or rather whilst he maintained canonical residence, taking the usual vacations, going on a pilgrimage, or living as a student in one of the Universities. When the non-residents came up to take part in the duties of the choir, they either were guests of their brethren, or were lodged in houses (*hospitia*) deputed to that purpose either in the close or liberty. Before the Reformation, possibly including the

dignitaries, there were usually about seven or eight residentiaries at most; but this number was dwindling down from time to time, to a state of positive inefficiency. At the close of the fourteenth century, Richard II. at S. Paul's found only two residentiaries who absorbed all the revenues. He was compelled to enforce the observance of the custom of Salisbury, with a threat of extorting 400*l.* from the chapter in case of neglect; that is, that one-fourth of the whole number should be resident. But in consequence of the "slender patrimony" of S. Paul's a century later, the number was reduced to four, the dean being counted as one (as at Lincoln) by Wolsey. At York, Henry VIII. directed that three, or two at least, of the residentiaries should always be resident, and the rest during half a year. Two canons were always to be resident at S. Paul's and Exeter. In fact, the expenses of admission, the claims of pluralities, natural indolence, and the discouragement of residence by residentiaries in order to secure larger incomes, had reduced attendance of prebendaries to its lowest condition.[1]

After the Reformation the restriction in the number of resi-

[1] The rate of payment was as follows:—

Wells, daily, the bishop 6*d.* and four white loaves; dean, præcentor, chancellor, treasurer, and archdeacon, 6*d.*, three black and two white loaves; a canon, 3*d.*, with one white and one black loaf. After 1342, these respective payments were 8*d.* and 4*d.*, with 5*d.* to the bishop, to each dignitary 4*d.*, and to a canon 2*d.* in lieu of bread.

At *Exeter* canons received 12*d.* a day, on days when the choir was ruled 15*d.*, on doubles 1*s.* 6*d.*, and three white loaves; 20*s.* quarterly, or six marks yearly, 3*l.* 12*s.* a year for bread and salt, and a share in the residue.

At *S. Paul's* the residentiary received out of the commune 24*l.* 6*s.* 7½*d.*, for the quarter 6*l.* 1*s.* 7¾*d.*, and in addition, 9*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.*, or 7*l.* with a distribution for residence in one quarter of 13*l.* 6*s.* 0½*d.*, for two quarters 1*l.* 9*s* 6½*d.*, for three quarters 2*l* 10*s.* 0¾*d.*, and for a year 2*l.* 18*s.* 4½*d.*; he received 13*d.*, three loaves, and thirty gallons of ale daily. On S. Paul's day 5*l.*, and for two months in the summer or winter 5*l.*; for a fortnight after S. John's day 5*l.*; and for a week after Michaelmas 5*l.*

At *Lincoln*, the residentiary had 8*d.*, raised by Bishop Sutton to 1*s.* a day, or still later, 95*l.* 17*s.* for the year.

At *Salisbury*, 6*d.* a day, 40*s.* for a quarter.

At *Lichfield* the canon received 12*d.* quotidian, and 2*s.* on double feasts; by Hacket's statutes he had 8*s.* 4*d.* a week, with a share in the dividend.

At *Chichester* the canon had 12*d.* a week; on greater doubles, 6*d.*, and on the six principal feasts 12*d.* in lieu of wine. In the thirteenth century, the quotidian was 3*d.*, and on great festivals an additional penny for wine.

At *Hereford* he received petty commons of wheat, mixtill, and oats, and 20*s.*; the major commons, consisting of wheat and pennies, and a quotidian for bread, if present at matins, grain for beer, and mass pennies.

At *York* he had a quotidian of 6*d.*, on feasts of nine lections 1*s.*, on doubles 2*s.* In all cases the dignitaries received nearly double, because they kept a larger residence than canons.

dentiaries was continued. It was reduced to four at Lincoln, and at Chichester in 1574, S. Paul's in 1518, and Hereford in the seventeenth century; to six at Hereford in 1583, confirmed in 1656; to nine at Exeter in 1560; to five at York by William III.; and at Lichfield by Bishop Overton, to eight by an Act of Queen Anne, and to six by statute of George III.; to not more than eight, or less than six, at Wells, by Charter, 34 Elizabeth, and to six at Salisbury by Bishop Jewel. But in addition to the reduction in the number of residentiaries, followed a reduction, or rather an evasion, of the ancient statutable residence. At York, there was, at first, a residence of a whole half year, and later, of a major residence of twenty-six weeks, and a minor residence of twenty-four weeks; by statute of George III. the entire term was made three months. At Wells, in the thirteenth century, residence was made to consist in attendance during six weeks and four days in each quarter, instead of half a year in the whole. At S. Paul's, an absence of seventeen days in each quarter was allowed. At Exeter the old residence of forty-six days in each quarter was reduced to thirty-six in 1544, to thirty in 1560, and in 1712 to twenty-three days or three months in the whole. At Lincoln, the residence had been for thirty-four weeks and four days continuously, or at intervals during the two halves of the year; in 1596 an absence of two hundred and sixty-one days in the year was allowed. At Lichfield, an absence of thirty days in a quarter (five canons residing together at a time) was punished by forfeiture of any share in the commune. By Bishop Lloyd's statute, a residence of ninety days in the year was required, under pain of a penalty of 5*s.* to be paid for every day of absence. By statute 1752, three members being added, one of the old foundation was to reside during two months, and one of the new foundation one month. In 1796 two calendar months constituted residence. At Hereford, sixteen weeks' absence in the year was allowed. By the Elizabethan statute, each of the six residentiaries was to reside half a year at least, and three months continuously (except the bishop's prebendary, who was to be resident during four months); but by the Caroline Statutes, thirteen weeks constituted residence, two months being kept together. At Salisbury, the law of obligatory residence was relaxed to one quarter, with an absence of twelve days, thirteen canons residing together at a time. In 1637 two canons at a time were required to be resident during a quarter. In 1672 a residentiary was allowed to compound for non-residence during three months in the year by a payment of 15*l.*

At the Reformation a still greater change took place. The

conversion of the monastic cathedrals into those of secular canons of the Benedictine houses of Canterbury, Rochester, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Worcester, and Winchester; and the Austin canons' house of Carlisle, in which the abbot had been represented by the bishop, and the duties of internal president were discharged by a prior. Henry VIII. proceeded further to reconstitute as cathedrals the Benedictine houses of Gloucester, Chester, Peterborough, and Westminster (dissolved within ten years), and the Austin canons' houses of Bristol and Osney afterwards removed to Oxford. Within the present century the collegiate churches of Ripon and Manchester were also elevated into bishop's sees. It is well known that Cranmer was averse to cathedral establishments, but in 1539 he drew up a scheme for one at Canterbury, which is, therefore, of considerable interest. He proposed that it should embrace a provost at 150*l.* a year; twelve prebendaries, each receiving 40*l.* a year; six preachers with 20*l.*; a reader of the Humanities in Greek, with 30*l.*; a Divinity reader in Hebrew, with 30*l.*; a reader in Latin Divinity and the Humanities, with 40*l.*; a reader in Civil Law, with 20*l.*; a reader in Physic, at 20*l.*; twenty students, each having 10*l.*; sixty scholars, each receiving five marks, to learn grammar, logic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; a schoolmaster at 20*l.*; an usher at 10*l.*; eight petty canons, each at 10*l.*; twelve laymen, having each 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; ten choristers at five marks each; a master of children, with 10*l.*; a gospeller, at 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; an epistolar, at 5*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*; two sacristans, with 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* each, and a numerous staff of servants and officials, with a common table (Works, Parker Soc. Publ. II., 396—398).

In the constitutions for these cathedrals of the new foundation, a fresh arrangement was made. The dean was retained; but instead of the old dignitaries, the præcentor, chancellor and treasurer, a system of annual elective officers was introduced, consisting of a vice-dean, a treasurer, and receiver. The præcentor was a minor canon, answering to the older succentor; and the sacrist, also a minor canon, discharged the duties of the sub-treasurer of the older foundations. Instead of vicars choral were appointed minor canons, deputies in priests' orders, the minor canons of S. Paul's, four at Hereford, and four at Chichester, who were entitled to serve vicariously at the high altar, being the only similar persons in the old foundation. The principle adopted as regards residence of canons was, that it should be continuous, with an absence of eighty days in the year; and the quotidian was paid for attendance at matins, high mass, and vespers 8*d.*, at Winchester, Gloucester, and Chester; 3*s.* 4*d.*, at

Ely; 10*d.*, at Carlisle; 1*s.* 4¼*d.*, at Durham; one-third or one-fourth of the number—that is, two at least were to be always resident; the prebend varied between 7*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* and 8*l.* 4*s.* 9½*d.* A statutable residence of twenty-one days continuously was insisted upon; a quarterly sermon was required, and canons were bound to officiate on the great festivals, the dean and sub-dean celebrating upon those of the first rank. Absence of one day or two days was permitted for preaching within a distance of fifteen or twenty-four miles of the city. But changes were made in course of time. At Ely, by statute of Charles II., canons were allowed to commute their stated period by a residence of fifty days continuously. At Gloucester, 1750—1785, a canon was permitted to keep a residence of only two months, with a single attendance at the services. At Bristol, with the permission of Queen Anne, the canons divided the terms of residence at their own will. At Peterborough and Worcester, two months became the customary residence. At Norwich, by statute of James I., it was fixed at five months, but reduced by Charles I. to one hundred and twenty days, and by Charles II., 1674, fixed at two months' attendance in the two daily services. At Durham, each canon kept a statutable residence of three weeks, and ordinary residence of seventy days.

As Whitgift had done before, Laud addressed himself to the compilation of new statutes for the cathedrals; but owing to a strong opposition on the part of the chapters, he was able to carry out his intention only at Canterbury and Hereford. In the former, he required ninety days of residence, twenty-one to be kept continuously, and one-fourth of the canons to be perpetually resident. At Hereford, he suppressed the customary entertainments during forty days after admission, and enjoined the provision of a simple table for the ministers of the church; and in lieu of a payment of a hundred marks, 40*l.* were to be paid to the residentiaries and 5*l.* to the fabric. Each canon was to celebrate once in the year, and to say prayers twice. Thirteen weeks constituted residence, two months being kept together, with a permissable absence of thirty days. Two canons were also resident together. By the earlier statutes of Elizabeth, six months' residence was required, and three residentiaries were always to be in attendance. The dean, in the old foundations, received an income usually double that of a canon; at Durham, 40*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.* a year, with 12*s.* 5*d.* quotidian; at Peterborough, 27*l.* a year; at Ely, 30*l.* 1*s.* 10½*d.* quarterly; at Carlisle, 29*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*; at Worcester, 33*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.*, with 5*s.* 6*d.* quotidian; at Gloucester, 27*l.* a year, with 4*s.* quotidian. His statutable absence was one hundred and forty days at Durham,

eighty days at Peterborough, a hundred days at Worcester, Gloucester, and Ely. At Canterbury, he was bound to reside ninety days, twenty-one of them continuously. At Gloucester, 1750—1785, his residence was increased, as at Rochester in 1785, to four months yearly. At Norwich, the residence of five months, prescribed by James I., was reduced by Charles I. to one hundred and twenty-two days. But he was permitted by all these statutes, to be absent if engaged as chaplain-in-ordinary, as King's almoner, or tutor to the prince, or if detained by church business, imperative necessity, sickness, or attendance at a provincial council or convocation.

In the evil times of the last century and later, the cathedrals shared in the general decadence of religious tone. Residence was curtailed or evaded; pluralities abounded; nepotism did its fatal work; and in several cathedrals the miserable precedent was introduced of having only one residentiary house maintained in common. To eke out the slender incomes of impoverished sees, bishops were permitted to hold deaneries. In 1829, the deaneries of S. Paul's, Durham, Wells, and Rochester were thus occupied: one canonry residentiary at S. Paul's, two at Durham, one at Christ Church, and one at Westminster. Bishops' sons, and sons-in-law, and nephews, held too many stalls and capitular livings not to attract well-deserved reprobation; and the low condition to which the celebration of the divine offices had declined, rendered an apology for the cathedral service a book necessary to be written.

Within four years the first note of Reform was sounded in Parliament; and in 1835 it was resolved to consider the state of the several cathedral and collegiate churches, with a view to the suggestion of such measures as might render them more conducive to the efficiency of the Established Church. The Ecclesiastical Commission followed upon this declaration. In 1838, it was provided by an enactment, most just so far as it went, that one cathedral preferment only should be held with a living; but in 1839 the grand mistake, culpable and short-sighted alike, was made to distribute capitular revenues. The telling speech of the late Bishop of London, in contrasting, to its disadvantage, the comparative wealth of S. Paul's with the indigence of the east end of the City suburbs, portrayed in vivid but unfair colouring, precipitated matters. It was a period of great political excitement and violence of feeling against the Church, and many ardent lovers of it believed unhappily, that they could only preserve its existence as an establishment by a costly sacrifice; whilst others, led away by a hasty show of

argument, resolved on devoting one portion of the Church's income to the relief of another part. The parochial system was to be aggrandized at the cost of that of the cathedral. In vain the majority of the parish clergy, twenty-two chapters, thirteen visitors of cathedrals, and both the Universities protested. In vain also a voluntary contribution towards the augmentation of poor livings on the part of the chapters was offered. The fiat of spoliation went forth. The cruel and unstatesmanlike measure of confiscation was perpetrated, and to all human sight and reasoning will be perpetuated.

It was asserted, that in the face of the decadency of the whole Cathedral system and its many abuses, it could be scarcely held doubtful whether it would not be wise that it should be at once and for ever abolished, and that it was no longer the ornament of, but the great blot upon the Establishment. But even the keenest opponents were compelled to admit that, if the whole revenue of the cathedrals was evenly distributed among livings under the value of 300*l.* a year, a paltry addition of 27*l.* to each was all that could be made; whilst the supporters of the ancient system, with all the power of unanswerable argument, maintained that in the state of general deficiency, the whole burden of its relief should not be laid upon cathedrals exclusively. It was well pointed out that poor incumbents, not poor livings, were to be regarded, as many a small benefice stood in the midst of a wealthy and increasing population, upon whom the duty of its augmentation lay; that many of them were in the gift of the Crown and its officers, rich corporations, private persons, and the owners of advowsons, who by such additions to the value of their patronage would be benefited, and not the parish clergy. Dr. Chalmers stigmatized the whole scheme as a vulgarizing process. There was one large and meritorious class of poor clergy which was entirely overlooked and forgotten — the priest vicars and minor canons. Besides, there were the choral vicars and lay clerks, who were subsisting on stipends wholly inadequate as remuneration, and compelled to eke out their scanty pay by trade, and means and occupations—such as public balls, suppers, and concerts—repulsive to their feelings and detrimental to their voice, calling, and position. And, in addition, there were the choristers, who should have received higher wages and a superior education; the organist and the master of the boys, men of superior attainments, and the humbler vergers, and porters, and bell-ringers and others, whose interests ought to have received primary consideration in the re-distribution of revenues which were bequeathed for their maintenance.

What a contrast does the modern cathedral establishment, which the reformers have left barely sufficient to continue the services, and that not, to use their own words, "in efficiency and respectability," present with the magnificence of either the ancient or post-reformational communities; between modern economy, which saw a waste in the numbers and grandeur of their members, and ancient piety which counted not the cost in GOD'S service and honour. At Salisbury, when Archbishop Courtenay assembled its members, there were the dean, præcentor, chancellor, treasurer, four archdeacons, sub-dean, and sub-chanter of canons, twenty-four priest canons, eighteen deacon canons, eleven sub-deacon canons, the penitentiary-general, the master of the grammar school, twenty-four priest vicars, eighteen deacon vicars, and eleven sub-deacon vicars, seven chantry priests, six stipendiaries, two clerks of sacristy, seven clerks of the altar, and two minor clerks of sacristies. At Durham, after the Reformation, were the dean, twelve canons, twelve minor canons, a deacon, sub-deacon, ten clerks, ten choristers, a master of the choristers, eight bedesmen, two schoolmasters, King's scholars, organist, two sub-sacrists, two bell-ringers, two porters, two bakers, two cooks, two butlers, an auditor, and a bailiff. Even with the remnant that is left, conceive an old cathedral filled with the great chapter, forty-nine canons at Lincoln, twenty-four at York, forty at Salisbury, forty-three at Wells, twenty-eight at Chichester, twenty-four at Exeter, twenty-four at Hereford, twenty at Lichfield, thirty at S. Paul's, besides dignitaries, residentiaries, and vicars. It must be remembered that the old choral habit was simply the surplice, the grey amess, and black cope; so that with the rich university hoods of various colours now worn, the mere outward effect would be enhanced a hundredfold, for the precious copes were only worn in solemn processions on the highest festivals. The specious language of the reformers was a hope that the sacrifices required from cathedrals would stimulate private benevolence, when they were actually confiscating the magnificent funds bequeathed by private benevolence for a definite purpose. Conceive on occasion even now, such a body of men, the chief of His heritage, as this noble company, no longer to be suspected of serving for fee or reward, engaged in chanting psalm and canticle and suffrage, and what might be its majesty magnifying GOD?

At the period of the foundation of the new cathedrals the proportion of stipends was as follows:—a dean received between 300*l.* and 100*l.*; a canon between 40*l.* and 20*l.*, more usually the latter sum; a minor canon ordinarily 10*l.*, sometimes 8*l.*; the

organist received 10*l.*; the gospeller and epistolar between 10*l.* and 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; a lay clerk between 8*l.* and 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; a verger between 6*l.* and 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*; a chorister 3*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*; a grammar boy between 4*l.* and 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*; and the master betwer 20*l.* and 10*l.* The vicars in the old foundations received, if present at matins, hours, and high mass, a quotidian of 1*d.* a day, besides stall wages, at Wells, and a mark for doing the office of a priest. At York, they received 40*s.* a year, and a quotidian of 1*d.*, besides a share in the residue. At Exeter their annual wage was 20*s.*; at Lincoln, 40*s.* and half a mark; at Lichfield, 3*d.* a day, with commons. But with true English independence they held their own estates, and were incorporated as colleges, confirmed by royal charter. Their old halls at Exeter and Chichester, the college at York, and other existing buildings in various places might again be rendered available for boarding the choristers.

Until the middle of the seventeenth century, the common table of minor canons, deacon, subdeacon, masters of the grammar school, and lay clerks was maintained on the new foundations; and, in many instances, the actual college was inhabited in those of the old foundation, while abundant hospitality was observed by the canons, who, for the most part, associated at meals.

In 1634, we find at Durham twelve sub-canons, thirty singing-men, and ten boys; there are now six minor canons and ten singing-men. At Carlisle, were sixteen petty canons and singing-men; there are now two minor canons and eight lay vicars. At Chester, there were sixteen singing-men; there are now six. At Lichfield, there were five petty canons, sixteen singing-men, six of whom were in orders and eight boys; there are now six vicars choral. At Worcester, were twenty petty canons, twenty singing-men, and ten singing-boys; there are now three minor canons and eight singing-men. At Hereford, were twelve vicars of the college, four deacons, and eight boys; now there are six vicars choral. At Gloucester, were twelve singing-men; at Bristol, ten singing-men, of whom four were in orders; at Wells, fourteen singing-men, of whom six were in orders; at Rochester, six petty canons and sixteen singing men; there are now four minor canons and six vicars choral. At Canterbury, six petty canons, eighteen singing-men, and forty singing-boys; now there are twelve vicars choral and ten choristers. At Chichester were twelve singing-men; at Winchester, six minor canons and twenty-three singing-men; at Salisbury, twelve singing-men; at Exeter, sixteen singing-men and ten boys; at Peterborough, eight vicars and eight laymen; and at Ely, eight minor canons

and eight singing-men. In fact each major canon was represented by a minor canon, and a magnificent choir, because efficient in numbers, was provided. The ecclesiastical reformers cut down the number of minor canons to two, left choirmen most inadequately remunerated, and choir-boys in the same condition, thus, as far as in them lay, rendering the choral services weak and feeble and uninspiring. A noble opportunity of restitution was allowed to pass. The minor canons, no longer having a common table, should have been given, not a paltry 150*l.* a year, but a sum approaching half the income of a canon, together with a house; but they should not have been permitted to hold a living without ceding their cathedral office; thus the choir would not have been denuded of minor canons. The attendance of lay clerks would have been enforced by the receipt of a stipend proportionate to the advance in the value of money. The organist should have been given the pay of a minor canon, and not compelled to waste time and talents on teaching extraneous persons in order to gain a livelihood. Once more, the epistolar and gospeller, or deacon and sub-deacon, being revived, with an adequate income, the organist and many of the choral clerks, would no doubt have taken at least the minor orders of the sub-diaconate under those conditions, and having acted as probationers for a time, could, like the former officers, have been promoted to minor canonries.

It was clearly intended that the choristers should be boarded and efficiently taught. But a noble opportunity was here again lost. Whilst the grammar or prebendal school, with its two grammar masters, who ranked only below canons, was provided for the education of the upper classes of the city, the choristers' school, under an able master, would have formed a perfect germ of a middle school, from which the deserving boy might have been elected a scholar of the upper establishment. Thus the poor singing-boy would have been enabled, by diligence and good conduct, to raise himself through the stages of university exhibitioner, vicar choral, and minor canon, to the highest rank in the cathedral. For this purpose, and to promote emulation, university scholarships ought to have been founded and augmented; and such as desired it, and were considered worthy, might have been received back into the theological colleges, where they existed, as candidates for holy orders and re-admission into the cathedral establishment. The cathedral patronage in livings might well have been bestowed on canons who desired to exchange the precinct for active parish work, or on minor canons when their voices became unfitted for choral services, or on a

laborious grammar schoolmaster; whilst a prebend, presented to a minor canon of mark and ability, who had left the cathedral for a living, would still more closely cement the union and affection of a most deserving class of men.

A glaring anomaly was introduced. A class of honorary canons was introduced in the new foundations—a name novel in this sense, which had from time immemorial been confined to certain sovereign princes, whose sacred unction was presumed to bear with it a priesthood. These new canons were to have no emolument, and were not considered to hold cathedral preferment. An honorary canon was simply one who was exempt from observing the canonical hours. There were, however, in Germany, honorary clerical canons, with "their right in the wind and their canonry in the air," as it was sarcastically said, and known as *ficti canonici*. But coadjutor canons, with the right of succeeding to residentiaryships might well have been introduced, who could have been paid their necessary expenses, either out of the common fund, or the income of the residentiary whose place they supplied, the principle of deputies being already conceded by the forty-third canon of 1603. Regard also should have been had to the prebendaries of the old foundation. The duties of non-residents had dwindled down into insignificance, and their connexion with the cathedral almost broken off. They are now only called upon to preach on certain allotted Sundays and holidays. At Chichester they are summoned for the election of a bishop; at Hereford, at the audit and to the installation of a prebendary; and at Salisbury, to an episcopal visitation of the chapter, the installation of a dean, and the election and enthronization of a bishop. But a true reform would have restored the influence of the great chapters (yearly summoned at Whitsuntide so lately as 1813 at Salisbury); every non-resident would then have taken his stall, and had a voice as one of the council of the bishop, whilst the audit of capitular accompts, the conduct of the services, and the arbitrament, in case of disputes between the lesser chapter and any other member of the body, might with advantage have been deferred to their consideration.

The signal difference between the old and new foundations lay in this, that in the latter a formal permission of absence was absolutely granted to the dean and residentiaries; in the former it was a mere concession. The offices, with the exception of the deanery, were annual and elective; and the dean and canons were not restricted from holding parochial benefices. The forty-fourth and forty-fifth Canons of 1603 recognized the residence of canons

on their livings, but required that "some," not one, should always be in residence at the cathedral. But the new reform defined cathedral residence to consist for three months, with a further term of two months' absence from their benefice, which was thus deprived of the presence of the incumbent during five months of the year. The canonries residentiary were also reduced in number, and the non-resident prebendaries deprived of emolument. In the new foundations the archdeacons were not bound to residence, but sometimes had a stall; in the old foundations their residence was reduced to a short term. But under the new rule the archdeacon of the district in which the cathedral stands will have a residentiaryship, and another bar to continuous residence was introduced. The archdeacon invariably, in the old foundations, held a prebendal stall, and in the new foundations the precedent might have been followed. An addition to his archidiaconal pay might have been made out of the capitular revenues in both cases, and he might have been given a vote in all diocesan matters mooted in chapter. But his appropriate place was surely in his archdeaconry, and, as the overseer of parish priests, on his living, his duties requiring continual attendance and perfect freedom in ability to travel and visit the district committed to his trust.

It would have been well also to have abolished the tenure of residentiaryships by professors and heads of houses. The most eminent scholars among laymen are disabled from becoming professors, and the masters of colleges have their appropriate work elsewhere. The calm of a cathedral close unfits a man for the active work of an educational body, which is ever requiring fresh blood; and the endowment of an office, already sufficiently remunerated, out of capitular revenues, acts as a dead weight on their employment upon more pressing objects.

The first proposition for uniting canonries to parish churches in the cathedral cities was mooted as long ago as 1641. Better far would it be that, as Thorndike suggests, these presbyteries should be "schools of the prophets and seminaries of able preachers through the several dioceses;" and once more, such an endowment of the diocese would be the patrimony of the mother church, although in a different, yet in as true a sense as in the earliest times. The sinecurist, that is, properly speaking, the canon without parochial cure of souls, has his ministerial duties in preaching, in administering the Holy Communion, in attending divine service, in various ecclesiastical offices and labours: while a conscientious man will find his time as fully occupied in such duties as those improperly and invidiously called the working

clergy, and these employments will so exclusively engage all his time as to render refusal of parochial preferment a necessity; for if he held it, and lived on it, the cathedral would inevitably become a secondary consideration in his mind. At the very time when the numbers and learning of parish clergy were rapidly being enlarged, the dimunition in the stalls for learned members of their body was made.

The Marquis of Blandford proposed the abolition of deaneries: the enforcement of residence during eight months yearly by a dean, was probably not unconnected with this wholesale scheme of destruction. But the permission to hold a living of 500*l.* a year in the cathedral city was an unfortunate and ill-advised measure. A dean already had the cure of souls within the precinct, and the rural deanery of the city might well have been secured to him in conformity with ancient precedent. There was this evil connected with the permission, as with the recommendation, that residentiaries should hold also city livings. There would be a diminution in the number of the city clergy. Moreover, the class from which the residentiaries should be chosen, men of learning and study, is not that which produces active parish priests. It would swamp the diocese in the city, whilst there are duties which they could most efficiently discharge. In this practical and utilitarian age, if cathedrals are to retain hold on the affections of the people, they must be at once assumed. The tenure of even a single living (from which now an absence of six months in the year is permitted), with an endowed dignity or residentiaryship, should have been prohibited.

The cathedral should be a diocesan centre of good works and active ministries. The choristers' school, in which these boys should be boarded, for that is essential to good discipline; the training college, the middle school, rendered models to the diocese, and the theological college would be under a wise reform entrusted to the chancellor, or one of the residentiaries as inspector; the treasurer or another canon would superintend and act as secretary of the Church Building Societies; a third might do the same office for the local boards of Church Extension, and Home and Foreign Missions: whilst the præcentor or the first canon could visit the various parochial choirs, and disseminate a good system of training, and improve the style and promote a better taste in vocalization and church music. One, at least, where there was no chancellor, prælector, or divinity reader, might deliver popular courses of divinity, address the theological students, and in various ways cope with the different forms of false doctrine as they arose. He might, with his brethren, go

out to preach, when invited, in parishes where the incumbent was aged, or unable to discharge his duties; whilst the staff of clerical assistants under an enlarged system would render other ministerial services. Under the present system a residentiary in his three months is condemned to an unsettled idleness, without permanent or congenial duties, beyond bare attendance at the choral services. The incomes in all the cathedrals should have been equalized to an adequate amount, and the tenure of any other remunerative employment forbidden to the residentiaries.

Recent parliamentary legislation concerned itself only upon revenues, without a consideration for the material point of duties with distinct spheres of work and individual responsibility. As Mr. Sidney Herbert urged, "either the Commissioners ignored the fact of there being special duties to be performed, or were quite insensible to their value and importance if performed. They found these bodies in an inert state, and their duties in abeyance. They should either have insisted on their duties being performed, or should have abolished the office. They did neither; they accepted the non-performance of the duties, recognized and established the neglect, and merely reduced the numbers and the income. But a non-performance of duty is as much overpaid by 500*l.* as by 800*l.* a year."

The purposes for which cathedrals were founded are specific: foundations of theological learning, almonries for charity, centres for diocesan usefulness, song schools, not as of late has been suggested, rewards or asylums for superannuated parish clergy, or political links to attach the upper classes to the Church; but for a still higher purpose, constant intercession and an unbroken liturgy of praise, whether filled by the great congregation, or only attended by two or three in the daily service, for in both alike the LORD is present in the midst. They have done penance for former apathy. Reform, organic change, has been rudely applied; and the result has not been a success. Reformation may now be essayed—the removal of abuses and neglect, under GOD and with His blessing it cannot fail. Family aggrandizement may be avoided by ecclesiastical patrons, even if the political interest of the State cannot be evaded; sloth can be crushed out, duties enforced; a noble emulation may be introduced, a high religious tone cultivated: and into such an atmosphere, purged by the late storm, and into such a work, conducted by God-fearing, God-loving men, the modest income of a canonry will not tempt the man who is unfit, who desires ease and loves wealth and the world.

What a noble field lies open to cathedrals, to Christianize, by the subtle influence of holy work and religious activity, the vast population that lies around S. Paul's, Bristol, Manchester, Exeter, Norwich; to influence the students of the upper classes at Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham; to further missionary enterprise at Canterbury; to train for toil among the artisans and manufacturing districts at Lichfield, Ripon, and Carlisle; to prepare men for pastoral efficiency in quiet country parishes at Wells, Gloucester, Chichester, and Peterborough. What a day of rejoicing would it be to see the libraries used freely by the parish clergy; to know the doors of every minster were standing open without an entrance fee to all who desire the opportunity of private devotion, or to study among these grand schools of art, of course under proper supervision and with precaution against injury to the fabric by idlers and malicious persons; to feel that almsmen gently tended, and boys duly cared for, formed parts in one great Christian family, and be assured that an adequate proportion of the funds were set apart to maintain the fabrics as they deserve, in the condition of a sacred trust.

Above all, the promotion of religious education, provision of alms, the advancement of good secular objects of regard, comes the grand duty of all, the celebration of Divine worship. Even now, as Dr. Arnold observed years ago, the contrast is too striking between the congregation of a foreign cathedral, where all seem to share in the service, and the nakedness of our own, where all, except the choir, is merely a monument of architecture. This reproach must be removed. It was an unfortunate day when the solemnity of the service was lessened by the disuse of the choral cope, sanctioned by the post-reformational canons, maintained at Durham till late in the last century, and still retained on grand ceremonials of state at Westminster and Windsor. Let it be universally restored as a symbol of a more earnest and dignified ceremonial. Meanwhile, we want music of greater simplicity, less artistic in structure, for use in the congregational portions of the services. We want real hearty services; we want hymns in their proper place; we want in every cathedral, according to the rubric, a celebration of the Holy Communion *at the least* on every Sunday, which should be always choral. We want this—more frequent communions—more than stained glass, or grand organs, walls cleansed of whitewash, or a fabric restored; we want a loving worship, and the crown and centre of all worship. An early service, such as was instituted at Lichfield, and has been preserved in many cathedrals, should be the rule in all. It must be remembered, that as at Win-

chester, to this day, Matins were said at a different hour from the Litany and celebration of Holy Communion; where this arrangement is not followed, it would be most advisable to curtail the morning sermon, which is frequently so protracted as to become tedious in itself, and a source of serious inconvenience, by rendering the entire morning service too long, and taxing the powers of attention during its most solemn portion. On the other hand, from the stringent injunctions to preach laid on deans and canons in the Reformation statutes, it would seem that this mode of instruction had been almost wholly neglected. For all this we want places where there "be many priests and deacons;" we want the deserted prebendal houses inhabited, and the close no longer a garden lonely and lifeless, but replete with signs of work and activity. A new reform would effect this, and a better administration of capitular property, we cannot doubt, would produce the means.

The young, the imaginative, and those who are always weakly yearning backward to the past, or dreaming of its reproduction in the future to the disparagement of the present, are apt to pourtray an ideal of perfection to themselves; a continuous festival in copes, a perpetual high mass, a day of unbroken processions with tapers blazing on rood-loft and beam; glittering crowns of many lights suspended from the fretted vault; dignitaries and canons vested in gorgeous copes of price, sitting in stalls "frequent and full," shadowed by the richest tapestries; vicars, and secondaries, and boys, all devout, all absorbed, and only watching the solemn beat of the rectors of the choir as they slowly walked to and fro with measured tread and softest footfall. The romance fades in the light of fact. The tapestries were a poor protection against the cold draughts; the copes, as inventories show, were too often disfigured by the most grotesque or secular embroideries; the floor, often unpaved, was twice in the year strewn with fresh straw, hay, or rushes, and on great festivals sprinkled with ivy-leaves; the grey amess of the canons, and the black amess of the vicars, the simple surplice, and black cope, worn by both, formed a comely but not brilliant, though the ordinary, choral habit; a few lights at the night hours, and a stated number of tapers at masses, usually sufficed; great canons too frequently wholly evaded the former and matins, remaining in their comfortable beds, or even coming up to their houses from the country in broad day in order to receive their quotidian, but not attending the services, or timing their arrival before the choir gates were closed, and stealing out before they were ended—at once irregular and indevout. In some instances actual punishment in chapter, or temporary degradation

with penance, were found necessary. Vicars to whom attendance was deputed kept "public drinkings and banquetings in choir," made ludicrous grimaces and indecent gestures, and wore huge grotesque masks; gossiped with suspected women between the pillars of the nave, left choir in the midst of services, frequented taverns, were dice-players, and sang noisily in the streets.

It is not a question of ritual but of manners, not of doctrine but of habits, which it required sharp discipline, loss of commons, a night's vigil before the cross, and actual scourging, to reform or keep in check. If in modern times the cathedral festival is deservedly condemned, in mediæval ages there were interludes, shows for sport, and dramatic performances of mysteries in those churches. The crowd of pilgrims, disorderly and indevout, pressing up to some popular shrine, through a nave which was only a vast avenue to the presbytery, has given place to the dense congregation, assembled at a special service, or the procession of parish choirs with banner and hymn entering to take their parts in one grand sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. There are no tradings in church, or marketing in close or cloister now; and the repetition of Paul's Walk, or the desecration of a common thoroughfare, as once at Worcester and Durham, would be simply impossible, whilst liberal contributions to the restoration of churches, the building of schools, the subdivision of capitular livings, and other works of good, contrast favourably with the stinted income of the ill-paid vicars of other days, and the neglect shown to such benefices and dependents. The past was no more faultless than the present; it should be our teacher not our exclusive model for the future. With due care and a "sober pomp, decent and unreproved," the existing services of the Church might be rendered far more impressive and solemn than at any period of her history.

It is quite true, we repeat, that negligence and abuses called down the retribution upon cathedrals. The expediency of the moment demanded a sacrifice which is perhaps irretrievable. But the parochial clergy were sunk as low, as torpid, as inactive, as cold, as lukewarm. The sins of the whole Church of England warred against her in that evil time. The cathedrals maintained at least daily prayers and choral services; and at the period of the great revival of the present time, their influence and precedent have abundantly been felt and used. Now the improvement in parish services, and the zeal of parish clergy will react on the diocesan centres, and on the hearts of their members, which is the most hopeful guarantee for reform. If not, let the sentence of annihilation go forth. But hope and wait awhile; children and persons devoid of reason only are unable to wait.

Places for learned men are indispensable to the existence of the Church. The strength of an establishment lies in its organization; and cathedrals are an integral element in it. Cathedrals and bishops co-exist, the chapter is the bishop's standing council and assistants in ordination, and a parish clergy, however earnest, without them will not avail to reform the secular world. In the devotion and quiet of the cathedral, is the protest against the turmoil and restless strife of the world that forgets GOD. In the cultivation of sacred learning by its members, is the armoury against the assaults of error, and a safeguard from innovation. From the cathedrals, the "mirrors of Apostolical antiquity," as Hooker calls them, and intermediate links between the clergy of parishes and the bishops, Christianity was first planted in England; from them it has since been watered and kept alive. They are the very heart of the parochial system, which they created, and have mainly sustained. They have been homes of religious learning, arsenals of truth, nurseries of our greatest and soundest divines, the glory of our literature, and defenders of the faith. They have kept alive the fire of piety in periods of gloom; and preserved a reverence for antiquity, precedent, and order in periods of hasty change and imprudent movement. They have shed their blessing on many a remote dry place, as well as on their immediate neighbourhood. History has pronounced one fact—the dissolution of cathedrals, the oldest incorporations in the country, was soon followed by the deprivation of bishops and the parish clergy, and by the fall of the monarchy. When the need of re-animating the whole Church system was most imminent, the Commissioners made havoc of the Houses of GOD in the land, despoiling their strength, and paralyzing their usefulness, in order to eke out slender pittances to livings which the whole country should have been canvassed to augment. Private bounty has not been found wanting to multiply churches and clergy since then, or to decorate cathedrals; unhappily the reformers had no faith—at least in their countrymen.

Conceive the irreparable blank, if the cathedrals had been swept bare! We should have lost the Presbyteries, which afford the moral unity and order, give the internal strength, and preserve the primitive character of the system. The close analogy which subsists between the constitution of a cathedral and that of the divinely appointed service of the Temple, has never been as yet recognized. The overseers and bishops [Num. iii. 32, Neh. xi. 14. 22]; the prince of the house of GOD and the dean [1 Chron. ix. 11]; the dignitaries and princes

of the priests [Ezra viii. 29, 1 Chron. xxiv. 5, 2 Kings xix. 2, Jer. xix. 1]; the archdeacons and overseers or princes of the Levites [Neh. xi. 22, 1 Chron. xv. 5, 2 Chron. xxxv. 9, Neh. xii. 22]; the courses of the priests and Levites [Neh. xii. 12, 1 Chron. xxiii. 6, xxiv. 20], and those of the priest, deacon, and subdeacon canons; the præcentor and chief of the singers [1 Chron. xxv. 5]; the chancellor and scribe [1 Chron. xxiv. 6]; the treasurer [1 Chron. xxvi. 20. 26. 29, xv. 22. 27] and chief sacristan; the vicars choral and singers [1 Chron. xv. 17, xxv. 2—4]; the Nethinims and doorkeepers, with the sacrists, porters, and vergers. This remarkable parallel is an additional argument for maintaining in churches which were the "first harbours of Christianity," a majestic service least unworthy of the greater glory of the latter house. The ties would have been severed which bind the entire diocese to the mother church, and we should have been disinherited of a glorious past, for the stalls have been occupied by the best men in a long spiritual ancestry, the great worthies now at rest, but united to us in the communion of saints. If the whole property of chapters had perished, there still would have been found men ready, without revenue or emolument, to discharge their duties for the moral and spiritual welfare of the Church. The emoluments were accidental; but a fellowship of clergy, partly attached to the cathedral, and partly scattered over the diocese is essential. The substantial reward is wanting, the honorary distinction is merely secular; the endowments at any time may be renewed. But had an entire suppression, instead of suspension of prebends, been carried by the reformers, the intimate relation and the integral membership of a sacred union of priests in one ancient body, would have been lost beyond hope of restoration. Now, if in better times the *congé d'élire* should cease to be a mere form, their voices may determine the election of a bishop in a case of vital moment to the whole Church.

One good, at the least, has resulted from the hasty and intemperate revolution which has shaken cathedrals. The deadness has passed away; a solemn warning has been given that they must be no longer stationary, or the prescription of centuries and the existence of chartered rights will not avail to secure them from destruction. The dormant life has been awakened, long-closed eyes have been opened to their spiritual charge, their heritage of privileges and duties. They were reconstituted at the Reformation, it was said, on the scale of primitive times, and "genuine sincerity."

It was foreseen that cathedrals exemplify the fact that no work

was ever so religiously begun, so prosperously conducted, or so happily completed, but was easily overthrown by carelessness and subverted by neglect; that no law was ever made so holy and firm but that it may fall into desuetude and contempt; and that there was but one cure—continual watchfulness and pious zeal. Again and again fresh statutes were enacted in the times of Elizabeth, James, Charles I. and II., and Queen Anne, to revive what was good and abolish what was corrupt. At length confiscation has been employed as a last resource in our times. If that terrible trumpet-voiced warning should be, alas! unheeded, then cathedrals may find another Hacket to plead for them, but it will be in vain. These times will little regard his argument. "Upon the ruins of the rewards of learning no structure can be raised up but ignorance; and upon the chaos of ignorance no structure can be built but profaneness and confusion." Prayers, religious services, preaching, advancement of learning, and education, good ecclesiastical government, and assistance rendered to bishops and dioceses, must make the inner beauty of these glorious buildings, which are monuments of former piety in their outer glory. Greater attachment is now evinced in them; greater pride is felt in their well-doing. Their external restoration, by the ample funds of a willing laity, must be an incentive to internal restitution and renewal of whatever has been mutilated or decayed. The reform must proceed from within, and once more the age will re-echo the conviction of Lord Bacon—"Deans and canons of cathedral churches are of great use." The reform from without, if renewed, will be extinction; it will never again attempt its abortive effort to produce new institutions of impossible perfection, or re-create the old.

MACKENZIE E. C. WALCOTT.

On the Revival of Religious Confraternities.

Of late it has been boldly asserted by some, and as resolutely denied by others, that our parochial system is a failure. The assertion and the denial are characterized alike by recklessness. The parish church, with the staff attached to it, can do a great deal, but not every thing. And, because it does not do all that is unjustly demanded of it, it by no means deserves to be regarded as a failure.

The parochial system does not lay hold of the great masses of scarcely educated, half-civilized men and women who teem in our large towns; it does not convert them in multitudes, and bring them weeping and praying to the altar-steps; but in expecting it to effect this, we are perhaps exacting of it a work which its machinery is utterly uncalculated to perform. And again, those who slight the parochial system overlook the wondrous effect it has in building up and consolidating work for the salvation of souls, commenced, may be, by other instrumentality.

The plane is an excellent implement for smoothing the rough plank, but it will neither fell the tree, nor saw it up into boards. If the parish system fails, it fails because it is required to do work for the accomplishment of which it was never designed.

A walk through the back streets of any large town on Sunday should convince the most sceptical, that there are thousands, and tens of thousands, whom the course of moral and religious instruction delivered in the parish church never reaches. The town curate labours in vain among the back slums of his district, and fails to persuade the unwashed denizens thereof to come to church, or, should he succeed, fails to attach them to the worship of God. The Prayer Book is to the ignorant man a puzzle. What knows he of the sublime perfections of "the wicked man?" Nor is the "Dearly beloved" calculated to convince him of all, judge him of all, and make him fall down on his face, and report that God is in us of a truth. An intelligent participation in the service demands a previous apprenticeship; and a man is hardly likely to go through this apprenticeship till his heart has been touched, and he has been, in a word, converted. But how is the clergyman to get at the multitude of godless individuals who

swarm in a town parish? The dissenting minister may do this; but the priest cannot, for he has not the time to preach much in the streets, and even if he should rouse souls, the elaborate service of the Prayer Book suits not their uncultivated tastes.

The existence of dissenting chapels is not a protest against Church doctrine, so much as a standing witness that the parish system is imperfect, and that the rigid Prayer Book offices do not meet the spiritual exigencies of the less educated parishioners. At the Reformation an experiment was made to adapt the offices, which had hitherto been exclusively reserved for the clergy and the religious, to the use of the people generally. And the result has been that the educated, who know exactly where to turn for Collect and Psalm, and General Prayers and Thanksgivings, have become attached to the monastic offices of Mattins and Evensong; whereas the illiterate are repelled by them, and driven to a simpler and more congenial worship in the meeting-house: for to them, the constant turning over leaves in search of scattered bits of the service is as irritating as was the "Pie" to the Reformers. Indeed, the Prayer Book offices are probably one great hindrance to the return of Dissenters to the Church.

But there is another impediment. Our parish churches are resorted to by upper, middle, and lower classes; by the highly, moderately, and the scarcely educated. The prevailing tone of education in a congregation is fair, and the preacher is obliged to suit this tone in his addresses, and to invest them with the refinement, and give them the polish suitable to such an audience. But, addresses of this quality meet with no response in the heart of the uneducated. The illiterate must have the truth put plainly and vigorously before them, without mincing of terms or refinement of expression, and illustrated by similes, and brought home to them by anecdotes, which would startle and shock the propriety of an educated congregation. A popular sermon to the uncultivated must have every atom of starch shaken well out of it.

And, it must not be forgotten, that the godless in the parish have to be brought to a consciousness of the existence of a GOD, a Heaven, and a Hell, and the value of their immortal souls, *before* they come to Church. Their consciences must first be roused, and then they may be brought to the parish church to learn the details of their duty to GOD and their duty to man. In short, the tree has to be hewn down and made ready, before the polishing plane can be applied to it. But how is this to be done?

The law of the land will not permit any tampering with the Prayer Book offices, and the parochial clergy have enough on

their hands—what with morning, afternoon, and evening prayers, together with schools—without going about the streets and lanes of the city preaching, exhorting, and preparing men for the Church service. They have their special work in church—the edification of the faithful. And the other work is done by the Dissenter. The local preacher takes his stand on the platform of a railway, in a mill-fold, or in a town-square, gathering around him a crowd of men and women who have neither been to school nor church, and know of GOD only through His Name used in blasphemy. Souls are touched; and then, adjournment is made to the meeting-house, where a simple service, and a plain stirring sermon satisfies their spiritual requirements; they find in the chapel a service on their own intellectual and spiritual level. No turning and turning of Prayer Book, but simply of Hymnal to No. this or that; and the sermon is couched in colloquial English, intelligible to the dullest comprehension, and not aimed far above their heads.

Now suppose for a moment that Methodism were not antagonistic to the Church, but did the work which honest John Wesley doubtless intended it to perform. The open-air sermon has been the means of awakening in the hearts of many individuals a consciousness that they are living apart from GOD. Milk for babes! For the Church service they are not ripe—a service which presupposes all who attend it to be instructed and godly Christians. No, they must pass through an apprenticeship first in the meeting-house, consisting of instruction in the faith, and in what is required of those who would live godly in CHRIST JESUS to do and to avoid, a preparation also for the service of the Church; after which they will be passed on to the parochial clergy, that by them the work may be confirmed and consolidated. Now all this preparatory work might be done by laymen, subject to rule, for the Church. At present all work of this nature halts at the chapel, and is done in opposition to the Church.

That clergy should be found to undertake such a work, is hardly to be expected; nor are gentlemen by birth and education those best qualified to perform it efficiently. There is now a great want of candidates for Holy Orders, to fill the parochial curacies; and there is no prospect of our obtaining a sufficient accession to the ranks of the clergy to occupy the field thus opened, unless their whole standard of education and social position were vastly lowered—a move to be greatly deprecated.

The work needed is a breaking-up of ground, that the sower may sow his seed in it afterwards; and for this work it is in vain to look to the classes whence our clergy are drawn. The supply is

falling off as the demand increases. Government offices having been thrown open, the number of candidates for Holy Orders from the Universities has sensibly decreased. Theological Colleges, such as Birkenhead and S. Bees, have been in operation for some while; but the men turned out from them are not such as would lead us to believe that these institutions will compensate for the deficiency from the Universities.

Several causes have operated to produce this scarcity in the ranks of the clergy, and only those can be touched on here which affect the subject of this article.

The young man destined for the ministry, has in prospect a poorly salaried curacy, leading for many years to nothing better; an income dependent entirely on the enjoyment of his health; and a life too subject to various annoyances. A man of education, he will have to mix with the illiterate. A man of keen sensibility, he will be subject to prying eyes watching his every movement, and the gossiping lips of the scandal-mongers will be stirring about him. He will be subject to an incumbent who may prove a bully, and to a Bishop who by a stroke of the pen, without giving his reasons for so doing, may destroy his future prospects. He will have no power of appealing for redress to law, no voice to state his griefs in Convocation. He will have to be careful not to do too much in the parish, lest the incumbent become jealous; nor too little, lest he be dismissed as indolent. If he be fond of science, he must reckon on having no time for pursuing his tastes; if of a literary turn, he must calculate on not having the means for purchasing books. Being a man, moreover, of sociable habits, he will have to live alone in a comfortless lodging, taking his meals, and spending his evenings, as a recluse.

Such a prospect is sufficiently uninviting to deter many, who have no family living in view, from entering Holy Orders; and it can be no matter of surprise, if we find that the number of University men who seek admission into the ministry become less every year.

The vacuum thus made has been partially filled with literates from our Theological Colleges. These men have been given a smattering of knowledge on an infinity of subjects, and have acquired an over-weening opinion of their own accomplishments; and, finally, they have been thrust into positions for which they are eminently unqualified. The education received has been too superficial and too general to make the men from S. Aidan's and S. Bees—as a general rule, to which of course there are many exceptions—other than conceited and vulgar. Had they been instructed in dogmatic theology, and thoroughly grounded

in the articles of the Catholic faith, and given a clear idea of the outlines of ecclesiastical history, instead of having been troubled with high mathematics, and classics, and the physical sciences, they would have proved, though not well read and polished men, yet valuable and, perhaps, humble labourers in the vine-yard, doing one work at all events well, which is a thousand times better than ill-performing fifty. We are acquainted with several excellent young men of the middle class who have been under prolonged training for the ministry, by a course of French, English history, geography and the use of the globes, chemistry, the classic languages, drilling and fencing, the evidences of Christianity, linear and perspective drawing, the Thirty-nine Articles, and Butler's Analogy;—yet there is hardly an individual among them who could be trusted to preach on any one of the articles of the Apostles' Creed without the certainty of his stumbling into heresy, through sheer ignorance. If men of all classes are to be taught theology, it must be ground into them, as you grind A B C into a child. But the practice of our Universities and Theological Colleges seems to have been to educate the candidates for the ministry in every "ology" under the sun, except the one "ology" which is required more especially of them, and that—theology. Ninety-nine chances to a hundred, if the men search it out for themselves; they are more likely to indulge their hearers with the thin gruel of their own excogitations, than retail to them the solid and sound meat of Apostolic and patristic doctrine.

And, unfortunately, it is to the town church, where the man of reading, judgment, and knowledge is required, that the alumnus of one of these institutions is sent, whilst a highly accomplished man and a scholar is often consigned to the seclusion of a country village, where his learning and his energy have no field for development—a razor set to cut cabbages,—simply because the country rector wants one curate, and offers £150, whilst the town incumbent of the Peel church prefers two inferior articles at £75 (with a title) apiece.

The Dissenters manage things better. With them, the right man is generally consigned to the right place. The man of power and learning is set in the town, whilst the ex-tailor rants in the village Bethel. The Roman Church, moreover, knows how to economize and to use her force. She has her preaching orders, the members of which can be sent from place to place as required, stirring up the spiritual life of parishes, producing in them, what may be termed, Catholic revivals, and then leaving the parochial clergy to gather in the harvest which springs from

their sowing. The parish priest is seldom a man of great ability; but the religious who are sent into his parish to arouse it, are. The pastor may, when he desires it, call in the aid of the regulars, who are trained preachers; and they do their work, which supplements his. The pulpit is not perhaps his forte; parochial work is not theirs. Our English clergy lament the mental exhaustion attending the production of sermon after sermon, week by week. The religious of a preaching confraternity are saved this; they take vast pains over a course, commit it to memory, deliver it; and as soon as this course has been preached, they vanish from the parish, to reproduce it at the other end of the country.

Now the Church of England, since the Reformation, seems not to have known how to make the most of her opportunities, and use advantageously the material in her hands. When the great revival of John Wesley took place last century, a glorious opportunity was offered her, and ample material was prepared. She had but to extend her hand to sanction the movement and organize it. She had but to sift the material and arrange it, and England and the colonies would have been evangelized. But she put the chance far from her; and that which might have been for her peace, became unto her an occasion of falling.

Had she held out the right hand of fellowship to Wesley, and provided the Methodist body with colleges; had she instructed its would-be teachers in the Catholic faith; and had she extended to them a licence to supplement the deficiences of the parochial system as constituted, and permitted them to preach—the Church might now be indeed the Church of the people. But she had crystallized about a bit of red tape, and to that she held firm. There was something too full of life and progress in the new movement, and not enough of the principle of crystallization; something too like vulgarity about it, and not enough of the savour of aristocracy; something too like preaching the Gospel to the poor, and not enough of strewing primroses on the heavenward path of the rich; something too much like the worship of GOD in it, and not sufficient devotion to the lion and unicorn, for my Lords Spiritual of the last century to touch it with one of their fingers.

Doubtless Providence ruled this aright, and the union was not effected, because the time for the organization of such a development was not fully come. Last century Churchmanship held too feebly to the strong anchor of Catholic doctrine, had lost so much of the tradition of Catholic worship, and was too deeply eaten into by the dry rot of Erastianism, for it to have been safe for the Church to have had the systematizing and organization of such a movement.

The present, however, is a fitter season for the experiment; and the sense of our shortcomings, acknowledged frankly on all sides, is perhaps the best sign that an attempt to remedy it would succeed. Now the attempt to recover to the Church the great masses of heathen in our towns, and to reunite to the Church the dissenting bodies, cannot be made by the parochial clergy unassisted. An agency external to, yet working hand in hand with, the parochial system is necessary. For this, there might be enlisted those who have hitherto been opponents of the Church, and those who have as yet been given no opening for doing ministerial work in the household of GOD; nay, more, through them the whole tone of theology throughout England and the colonies might be raised, and a barrier of orthodoxy might be cast up, against which the waves of modern infidelity might beat, but which they could never overthrow.

We have trusted hitherto in our moles of hewn and cemented stone, skilfully wrought and carefully compacted together; and though block after block has been torn out of place, and cramp on cramp has been snapped as tow, we have replaced them carefully, and the fight has been continued as before. Yet a humbler breakwater of unhewn stones, or sea-washed pebbles, ever moving in and out among each other, without cement or bond of iron, held together by an invisible law, acting not as units but as a body, compacted by the violence of the surge, moulded by the beating of the wave, restless yet unchangeable, feeble in its component parts yet mighty to endure in its unity—such a barrier will stand and turn the waves, where the noblest creation of human skill would perish. For the battle is not with the strong; and GOD hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath GOD chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are.

Far be it from us to deprecate the artistic construction, in order unduly to extol the other. Both are needed; there is room for both. What we would say is, leaving metaphor, that the struggle between dogmatic Christianity and Freethinking is at hand, and, judging from the signs of the times, will be fiercer than any that has preceded it, and we shall want some bulwark to the faith of the poor and uneducated. Learned theologians can do battle for the faith of the highly cultivated minds in the upper classes, but plainer and ruder defences must be thrown up to protect the creed of the illiterate. The faith of the latter will be assaulted, not through volumes of essays and pamphlets, but

by stump orators and penny infidel tracts. The stump infidel orator must have the stump Christian orator opposed to him; the doubt-inspiring tract must be met by the faith-teaching tract. The parish priest hears little or nothing of the difficulties which beset the poor artisan's belief; the man is shy of propounding them to his pastor; nor does the educated man know the peculiar style of argument which will convince self-taught men. A reason which would bring conviction to the logical mind, fails utterly to satisfy the untrained intellect, whereas a logical fallacy will often thoroughly convince. None but those who live among self-educated, shrewd people can have the opportunity of meeting their difficulties on the necessary ground, and at the proper moment when they arise.

In our humble opinion, a large body of religious, such as suggested, would exactly supply the deficiency which we feel; a body of men not wise in this world's wisdom, nor schooled in hermeneutics, but strong in their faith, and knowing nothing save JESUS CHRIST, and Him crucified. They might be used as book-hawkers, might serve as Scripture readers and as catechists, and take their place on the side of CHRIST in public discussions.

The Roman Church has a system of occasionally holding public disputes; when a religious is set up to argue either on the infidel or on the Protestant side, whilst another meets all his difficulties and combats his arguments. These discussions are immensely popular, and do an incalculable amount of good, for the audience consists of people upon whom similar arguments against their faith and religion are constantly used; and, by these meetings, they are primed with cut-and-dried answers to questions which perplex them. Some such a work might be undertaken in England; but, as may well be seen, could only be conducted with advantage by those thoroughly trained for the purpose; for the sham dispute is pretty sure to resolve itself into a real one, should a dissenting minister or an infidel demagogue take up the cudgels—and, if he did so, all the better.

In prospect of a battle with unbelief, we must review our ranks, and see what bodies of men will be best fitted to endure the brunt of the fight. And we think that there can be no question, that the real battle will rage between the Catholic party in the Church of England and the Freethinkers. Little support can be expected from the Low Churchmen. They are desultory skirmishers, and their place will probably be, like David's warriors, to "tarry by the stuff."

For the struggle will be emphatically between Dogma and Antidogma, and Protestantism is hopelessly undogmatic. It

consists in a system of negations; it is destructive, not constructive; it has a joint here and a joint there of doctrinal backbone; but the joints do not cohere, and are not bound together by firm sinews into one strong spinal column of Catholic doctrine.

It is, moreover, of paramount importance that the dissenting bodies should be reunited to the Church, or, at all events, that all the zealous and devout from among them should be taken into the ark, and that only cant and humbug should be left to founder in their cockle-shells when the tempest breaks. For *then* Protestantism will be utterly powerless to save itself, having cast away anchor and helm, and pitched tackling out of the vessel.

We believe that the only means, under GOD, of persuading pious Dissenters to take refuge in the Church, will be the teaching and the example of the travelling friar. If a child has got hold of a bad book, better to provide it with a good one than deprive it altogether of books. Just such must be our treatment of persons with dissenting proclivities, if we are to restore them to the Communion of the Faithful. We must supply them with something bearing a resemblance to Dissent in outline, yet radically differing from it.

What is it that gives Methodism such a hold upon the people? Let us examine some of the leading causes very briefly, and see whether these causes cannot be made to operate *for* the Church, instead of *against* her.

1. One great reason of the hold Dissent has on the poor, is the self-denying lives which the preachers did or do live. They are men like those amongst whom they work, poor and humble in station, and standing witnesses against worldliness. The poor man's heart warms to the preacher whom he sees in shirt-sleeves "heaving muck," and living as hard a life as himself, and wearing as ragged a coat. But it closes up against the Church-parson in his glossy suit of black and spotless white cravat, dashing past in a pony-chaise, with his daughters, to the squire's croquet-party. The poor man may judge harshly—but he does judge; and we have to deal with facts.

2. Another cause of the success of Dissent has been already alluded to, it consists in the simplicity of the schismatic service.

No one, till he has considered, can realize the difficulty found by those who have never gone through their apprenticeship in the Prayer Book. Let us suppose that a collier, who reads with difficulty, has had his heart touched, and is persuaded by the parson to come to church. He opens his book at Morning Prayer. The first words he sees are "When the wicked man, &c.;" but the priest begins, "If we say that we have no sin,

111597

&c." This puts our friend out till he has discovered the sentence, and in the meantime, "Dearly beloved" is half over, and this exhortation, consisting of three long-winded sentences of a most involved nature, is to him so much Chinese. All goes on now swimmingly till the Psalms are given out, and these, with the assistance of a neighbour, to the confusion of the collier, are found. Then comes the First Lesson, for which the man begins an ineffectual search in the direction of Tate and Brady. After this, he is pointed out the place of the *Te Deum*. The Second Lesson having been read, he turns to the *Benedicite*, as the piece immediately following the *Te Deum*, for he does not observe the rubric in italics. He turns as red as a turkey-cock at being put right once more by a considerate bystander, and then with a jump over the *Jubilate* he gets to the Creed. Now the bewildered man kneels in fluttering hope that the rest will be straightforward work. But, not at all; off goes the parson to a collect; and where to look for the collects the poor man knows not. However, before he has done wondering, back comes the minister, and says two collects in the Morning Service. Then all rise for the hymn; and now a third book is in requisition.

The hymn over, our friend fondly deems that the prayer for the Queen's Majesty, &c., will follow. But, not so; the clergyman is at the Litany, and the unfortunate man explores the Thirty-nine Articles and the Tables of Affinity in hopes of unearthing it there. Litany over, with perhaps another digression to the General Prayers and Thanksgivings, the parson adjourns to the altar, and begins another part of the book, viz. the Communion office, nor does he remain there even, but is off to the Collects Epistles, and Gospels in a trice, and then back again.

Next follows the sermon, and perhaps after it the Church militant prayer; and then—like the story of the bear and the fiddle—in the very middle of the Communion Service off go the congregation out of church. Our collier shakes his head, and says, "Enough of Sunday hide-and-seek! I'm off to the Ranters. I don't like to look a fool amongst folk what knows their book. I'm no schollard; so Church ain't t'place for me."

Now, if any of our readers doubt the truth of this picture, let them procure for themselves a well-known adaptation of the Sarum Offices, entitled, "The Day Hours of the English Church," and attempt by themselves to find their way through Prime or Vespers. They will then sympathize with the Dissenter when he comes to a service of the Book of Common Prayer.

3. Another cause of the success of Dissent, is the invariable practice of extempore preaching in the chapels.

The uneducated and the poor have an extraordinary affection for extemporaneous discourses. They believe them to be the pure outgushing of the Spirit, and cannot be persuaded to regard those discourses as emanating from the heart, which they know proceeded from the brain on Saturday, and which they see issue from the pocket on Sunday. The prejudice against written sermons is natural, though unjust; it has this sound foundation, that the written discourse has often received such a polish in the study that it is unintelligible in the pulpit; whereas the extemporaneous address is couched in briefer sentences and plainer words, is more natural and therefore more understandable.

The vigour of Dissenting sermons is generally due to the fact that in the schismatical Training Colleges elocution and sacred oratory are part of the curriculum of education for the students, so that the man who has no good style of his own, may be taught to copy one set before him. Besides which, the Methodist preacher is not hampered, as is the priest, by the variety in mental standards of his congregation. The parish priest has the squire, an M.P., in the pew under him; the doctor and the lawyer in theirs occasionally, at all events their wives; the leading tradespeople occupy yonder pews, and a dozen old goodies with no minds at all, except for their "rheumatiz," are looking up from the free seats. The preacher must not talk plain homespun English, or the tradespeople will think that he is lowering the dignity of the pulpit; the M.P. expects some mental pabulum, or he will vote the parson a twaddler; and so, between these stools, he is let down to the ground.

And now, the question must be asked and answered—Cannot the Church evolve from her bosom an organized body of men who can occupy the place hitherto resigned to schism; a body of men attaching the people to the Church by winning their affections through the example of lives of self-denial and voluntary poverty, who can convert the multitude, waking the masses from their sleep of sin with trumpet voice, training people in Church doctrine, supplying them with answers to the suggested doubts of infidel tempters, furnishing them with Catholic literature, and erecting homes of religion for those who have a vocation for the highest walk in the spiritual life?

We are wedded to precedent. Let us look to the precedent of the Middle Ages. Then, as now, the offices of the Church were not "understanded of the people." Then, as now, there was inefficiency among the parochial clergy. Then, as now, there were multitudes who would not come to church, so that the only chance for them was that the church should go to them.

Then, as now, there was a dearth of educated clergy. And how did the Church meet the difficulty? She founded Religious Orders. She gathered together under one roof men of all ranks and grades, and trained them in self-denial, in self-control, in the art of winning souls, in the art of preaching. Having educated them, she sent them forth through the length and breadth of the land, to occupy the pulpits of the parish churches, or to stand up on the wayside hedge, or on the steps of the market cross, and appeal to those who would not come to the House of GOD to hear. Was there a savour of heresy in the wind? North and south, east and west, flew these barefooted, serge-frocked champions of orthodoxy, and in rude language, with argument telling home and forcible, they taught the people the right, and prepared them to combat the wrong.

All these men, remember, were first trained themselves, first grounded themselves in doctrine, first primed themselves with arguments, and educated in the art of extempore speaking, and then were sent abroad to retail to tens of thousands what they had learned themselves in the seclusion of the cloister. Specimens of the sermons of these men abound. The press of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries teemed with their productions, and it is impossible to deny the extraordinary power they possessed. Every quality requisite to the formation of a popular preacher to the lower classes was found in them. They were full of unction; they excelled in descriptive power; their arguments were telling, if not always logically conclusive; their illustrations were pointed, and their style full of fire. Throughout their productions there runs a family likeness; a recurrence of the same illustrations and similes; and this is owing to the fact of the men having been brought up in the same school, where the same arguments, and the same examples had been impressed upon them. And the people heard them gladly.

Every where did the preaching friar attract a crowd. He was a man who knew what hunger was, and what it was to be pinched with cold. The poor man was aware of this, and recognized a brother. If you sound a note on one stringed instrument, the corresponding string vibrates on another. So is it with the human heart, and especially with the notes of suffering. GOD Incarnate, by becoming a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief, vibrated a chord in the great human heart which will quiver through eternity. As with the Master, so with the follower. The key to the success of Christianity is in the pangs of its Founder; the preacher of the Gospel now, if he is to reach the broken-hearted, and the poor, and the oppressed, must have

been consecrated by the hand of suffering laid on himself. The poor man's heart responds to the heart of him who has suffered poverty; and therefore of old he loved the friar.

The secular clergy looked with jealousy on the preaching brothers; a jealousy quite natural, but not always deserved. The friar did the work which the parish priest had failed to do, and therefore was gibbeted in unmerited spite on the carved benches and misereres of the secular churches. He stood to the parish priest in the relation the dissenting minister stands to the same official now-a-days; but with this important difference, that the friar worked the people up to Church, and the dissenting preacher draws them from it. Indeed, the minister of the schismatical tabernacle has coolly stepped into the place in the people's affection formerly occupied by the religious; and it remains to be seen whether a restoration of the order of preaching friars might not recover speedily its old position, and consign Dissent to the bats and owls; but, as restored, care must be taken to prevent a recurrence of antagonism between the seculars and regulars in a parish.

For a century, the drain to the schismatical ministry has been from the lower and lower middle classes; and the Church has made no use whatever of the pious souls which have been stirred up among the ranks of the artisan and small shopkeeper. Now that the Church is to a certain extent recovering her hold over these classes, or rather is influencing individuals belonging to them, a number of zealous young men have cropped up, burning to do something for GOD and Holy Mother Church, yet held back by the sad consciousness that there is no opening afforded them for work. They feel that the priesthood is not their sphere. Neither their education nor their culture are such as would make them comfortable in the position which a clergyman is expected to occupy; yet they long to be doing something for the salvation of souls, and are ready to sacrifice themselves to the work, should an opportunity be afforded them for so doing. We have met many such. But for their Church proclivities, the temptation to the dissenting ministry would be too strong for them.

Well! have we no work for these men to do? If, apart from the Church, they could work the mighty work which Dissent has effected, what would they not do when united to the Body of CHRIST, and in constant participation of the life-giving Sacraments? In fact, the number of these men is rapidly increasing, not in parishes under Puritan *régime*, there they drift off to the dissenting colleges, and become schismatical preachers, but in parishes worked on Catholic principles, there these men abound,

fervent in spirit, serving the LORD, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, continuing instant in prayer, waiting, like the crickets in Mrs. Gatty's fable, waiting and chirping—"There's a good time a coming, when houses will be built to which we can retreat, and which will be our homes; only—wait a little longer!"

The time is approaching when the Church must decide what answer she will make to the silent cry of all these earnest souls for work. Some drop off year by year to Roman monasteries, weary of the delay. What will the Bishops do when the long pent-up desire bursts into actual work, when the fire is kindled and the tongues speak? The episcopal boot is so accustomed to descend on every spark of vitality in the stubble of the Establishment, that perhaps it will follow precedent, the illustrious precedent of the Wesleyan schism, and stamp out all this zeal for GOD and the Church. Or, can it be that the Bishops will prove sufficiently large-hearted to hold forth the right hand of fellowship, and say—"We betrayed the cause of the Church in the last century; we acknowledge our fault, and make what reparation we can, by wishing you good luck in the Name of the LORD?"

It must not, however, be supposed that the desire for the religious life is manifesting itself in the lower classes only. Many a curate feels a similar vocation. He feels the dreariness of a lodging, and looks back lovingly to the old collegiate intercourse. He groans under the despotism of the rector's wife, who has her little schemes in the parish, athwart which the "young man" is constantly running foul. He preaches sound doctrine, and is denounced by a spinster lady of a certain age to the Bishop, who sends for him to his palace (return ticket, 10*s.* 6*d.*), and lets him clearly understand that a repetition of the offence will be visited by withdrawal of licence. He feels a craving for sympathy and interchange of spiritual experiences. He is painfully conscious of the peril of his own condition, from want of time for prayer and meditation; of his own efficiency as a teacher being marred by dearth of theological books. Oh, for some cloister where to study and pray, and whence to issue at intervals, like a giant refreshed with wine, to rush into some den of sin, and by the fire of his zeal, and the fervour of his eloquence, to rouse dead consciences to a knowledge of GOD, and of the value of their own immortal souls.

It may be thought a robbing of Peter to pay Paul, if we draft off our parochial clergy into religious communities. But it can hardly be expected that many will feel the vocation to a life of poverty and celibacy, and the religious house will probably send forth a compensating balance of men who, after prolonged instruc-

tion and probation, feel that their vocation is rather in parochial work than in mission travelling. Or, there may be men who will find that they have mistaken their call to a celibate life. These will be at liberty to depart; they will be none the worse for the careful dogmatic training they have undergone, nor be supposed to be cut off from the society; but simply, to have elected the position of associate, instead of advancing to that of brother. Thus, we may fairly calculate on an interchange of men from secular to religious, and from religious to secular lives; and this interchange would foster a sense of mutual reliance, and prove beneficial in promoting a fellow-feeling between the two classes.

There is a danger looming in the Church horizon likely to precipitate the formation of Religious Confraternities. We mean the threatened attempt to interfere with the liberties of the English Church on the part of Government, to compromise its orthodoxy by Privy Council decisions, and to curtail its ritual, thereby striking a blow at its doctrine. What line will be pursued by the prelates of the English Church is uncertain; but their policy has of late been one of oppression to the Catholic party, and we can hardly calculate on their support to any great extent. Courage in the cause of GOD and the Church is at present not the distinguishing characteristic of her dignitaries; and it may be questioned whether, when a bill is introduced for the altering of the vestments of the priesthood, the episcopal mitre should not be abolished also, as antiquated, to make way for the more appropriate symbol of the white feather. If there is to be a struggle between the Church and the State, we can hardly expect to find champions on the side of GOD'S household in those who owe their position, and the enjoyment of their emoluments, to the State.

But should an oppressive measure be brought to weigh upon the Catholic party in the Church, it will be the occasion of a decisive movement. There has been talk of late of State interference with the doctrine and ritual of the Church leading to secession on a large scale to the Roman obedience, or the establishment of a Free Church. Either of these alternatives is too violent to be contemplated with composure.

The clergy, and many of the laity, in the Anglican Communion know their ground so well, and have so thoroughly probed the weaknesses of the Roman Church, that the leakage Romewards has almost stopped, and the most advanced of the Catholic party are the very last to whom secession in that direction would present any attractions; whilst the precedent of the Nonjuring schism stands before them as a caution against separation into a Free Church. But the revival of monastic orders would present

no such difficulties; and the liberty enjoyed by Religious Confraternities, and their freedom from episcopal supervision, would render such asylums peculiarly tasteful to the aggrieved. It would be a split in the Church of England, but not a secession from it. That such a move would be attended by bitterness and contention is certain. There would be a soreness between the regulars and seculars, much as existed between the juring and non-juring, or the *sermentés* and *insermentés*, priests. The tone would be different in each body, and mutual dissatisfaction would impel each party into extravagances. Such would in all probability be the result of legislative enactments on Church matters oppressive to the consciences of Catholics. But, if there be no violent measures adopted to force on such a movement, no jealousy and heartburnings need sever regulars from seculars. The latter would soon find the value of the others, and appreciate the importance of the assistance they could render them in their parishes; whilst the former would be careful in no way to mar the peace of a parish, or to let any tokens of opposition be observable in their proceedings. Indeed, the very work upon which the preaching friars would be employed would render collision difficult. They would be engaged upon rudimental work, the awakening of the unconverted masses; and the object of their labour would be, to pass on those awakened to the hands of the parish priest. The friar would not necessarily receive confessions, nor would set up altar against altar; but would as a rule send the penitents to the incumbent or his curates, and the would-be communicants to the parish church.

In large towns, where the parochial system is a dead letter, more liberty might be allowed, such, for instance, as the building of monastic churches served from the central House. But for these it might be well to solicit episcopal licence, though such is no more needed for religious churches than for our college chapels at the Universities; all collegiate and religious buildings being out of episcopal jurisdiction by ecclesiastical law and custom. We do not enter here into the question of the advisability of Monastic institutions being free from the supervision of the Bishops. We simply state the fact, that there is precedent for their being so; and such they will be on their revival, if the Episcopal body continues its aggressive policy against the Catholic party. The Anglican prelates have so diligently accumulated straws wherewith to break the camel's back, that the poor beast will kick over the load, and decline to submit his back to other burden than that laid on him by Providence—his own hump. The Catholic clergy, whilst readily acknowledging the essential

necessity of an Episcopacy for the perpetuation of the ministry and the confirmation of the baptized, if much further exasperated, will perhaps deny the Divine right of the Bishops to hinder work for CHRIST and the salvation of souls.

We have said nothing of foreign missions, and the influence which Religious Orders might exercise upon them. All the work of the kind done by the Roman Church, has been effected by the agency of Confraternities of self-denying, trained missioners. The failure of our own system of attempting to do every thing by means of seculars, is the best proof that a new organization is required to be brought to bear upon the work. The conversion of all Europe by the Monastic societies, is a witness to the mighty results which may be obtained by combination.

We hardly care to suggest more than the broad outlines which the revival of the system should assume, as the adaptations, and the working out of details, must be left to experience. One thing is very evident — that throughout Europe, even under the most favourable circumstances, the contemplative orders are fading away, and the active societies are stepping into their places. We would not suggest any reproduction of a purely contemplative and ascetic order in England. There seems to be no demand for it, no field for it to occupy. A Carthusian house would therefore prove a mistake. The Cistercian Order was an agricultural society, of infinite benefit to England in the Middle Ages, settling in moorland dells and on sea-board morasses, cultivating the moor and draining the swamp, and teaching the rude people who dwelt around the arts of civilization and the value of their immortal souls. For such an order there is no need in England; though perhaps it might prove the evangelization of Central Africa. The Dominican rule is too severe; the Franciscan would need modification. Congregations of secular priests, such as the Passionists, Redemptorists, or Oblates, would raise no prejudices, the vows being simple and the dress not peculiar. Any Confraternities under ancient rule modified, or rule altogether new, which would undertake the education of the young, the training of candidates for Holy Orders, the evangelization of heathen lands, or the conversion of our heathen at home, for conducting missions in parochial churches, or retreats for secular clergy, would find an open field for their labours, men ready to enter the societies and cast their energies and abilities into the work assigned to them, and a public ready, after the first shyness is over, frankly to acknowledge their excellence, when it sees the greatness of the work effected by such instrumentality.

Let us suppose an institution of the kind proposed settled in

its building, away from the bustle and excitement of a town, yet within reach by rail of populous places; such, for instance, as Fountains, or Riveaux, retired nooks where the brethren might take sweet counsel together and walk in the house of GOD as friends, but ready at a moment's call to be in Leeds, Bradford, Halifax, Sheffield, Manchester, or Liverpool. Or, if we take the south, a mother house nestled in the coombs of the South Downs, whence the religious might issue when required, and in a couple of hours be in London or Brighton, Portsmouth or Southampton.

In this house there would reside the superior and the clerical brethren conducting the training of the probationers in dogmatic theology and in popular elocution; at the same time that their spiritual training in self-denial, humility, prayer, and meditation was being conducted. From Advent to Easter the major portion of the society should be dispersed over the country, conducting missions, the lay brothers working in hamlets under parochial clergy, the clerical brothers preaching Advent and Lent courses in any parish whither they are summoned; each brother in Priest's Orders taking with him a probationer to assist, and to learn the manner of carrying on these spiritual revivals. In summer, from Easter to Advent, the whole body would be reunited in the central college or monastery, unless some of the lay brothers were sent about the country on fixed rounds, preaching in the open air, and book-hawking, occupying almost the position of the primitive evangelist.

A word on the subject of those parochial revivals called "Missions," which have been imported into England from France:—A parish priest is sure, after long-continued labours, to find that, for some indiscoverable reason, his flock make no further advance. The number of attendants at week-day services decreases; the communicants are less frequent in their approach to the altar. He sees no apparent cause for this languor in the religious life of his parish; he has done his utmost; but a gradual exhaustion of spiritual energy seems to have become prevalent. No particular spiritual disease has stricken down his flock; rather, they are in a condition predisposing to disease. When the body is relaxed, and the vital force feeble, the wise physician administers a tonic which restores the tone of the body. Such a tonic to the spiritual life is a Mission. The incumbent noticing the general apathy, sends for clergy trained to conduct a Mission, and, for a week or fortnight, gives up to them his pulpit, and surrenders into their hands the spiritual direction of his parish. During the period, nightly, the pulpit is occupied by a vehement and zealous preacher; the church is

crowded; souls are quickened; penitents throng the confessional; the daily Eucharist is attended by numerous worshippers. Those who had fallen away, are restored. Those who had become careless, cast aside their indifference. The parish priest himself is reinvigorated, and feels his hands stayed up. For years the results of the Mission are apparent. But it is not every one who can direct such a revival. A good preacher is not necessarily a good missioner; for the awakening sermons are only a portion of the work. Homes have to be visited, where the parochial clergy have failed to obtain influence. Souls have to be grappled with individually, which have been long hardened and dead in sin; sluggish souls have to be shaken out of their torpor, and unspiritual natures to be quickened with a burning zeal to which they have hitherto been strangers; and thus is work done, not in the church, but in the cottage, in the field, and in the street.

Now the work of Missions to parishes is one for which a Religious Confraternity would be eminently well qualified. As Church matters stand at present, an incumbent can scarcely obtain suitable men to operate a revival in his parish; but were a Religious Order in existence, he would write to head-quarters, and men would be sent him at once, whose business it was to conduct such Missions with judgment, and advantage to souls.

We have already alluded to the spiritual dryness and weariness which creeps over the secular priest. If his body needs reinvigoration by a yearly continental tour, and his mind requires a month at least of entire relaxation from care—his soul, as well, demands a period of retreat, when he may turn his thoughts inwards, free from all distractions, for the examination of his own spiritual condition in the sight of GOD. The cure of souls involves the temptation to the priest of neglecting his own spiritual-gardening, in anxiety about the welfare of others. A religious retreat is a necessity to the soul of a devout priest, as great as a run from home is necessary to the health of his body. He who stirs not from his parish, loses freshness and energy; and he who retires not into retreat, endangers the life of his soul.

The difficulty of establishing retreats is due to the want of suitable buildings in which to congregate a large body of men, as well as to the dearth of clergy capable of directing such retreats. But the home of a Confraternity would be the natural place in which they might be conducted, where there would be accommodation for all, and where the guidance would be entrusted to men qualified for the work.

Half the cause of the failure of individuals to do great things

for GOD, is their isolation. A devout layman is elevated to the rank of Scripture reader, but he produces little effect upon the people he works amongst; and why? Because he is a unit. How different if he were a member of a Confraternity! In a body of religious, the principle of cohesion would be strong; not only would there be the great bond of union with the Church, but there would be the close tie of fellowship with every member of the same society, producing that *esprit de corps* which was the secondary cause of so much mission work being done in the Middle Ages. For then, each society competed with the others in good works; each emulated the others in holy zeal. No member of a brotherhood could feel his isolation. He would not be one, but many. Whether in Labrador or New Zealand, in Central Africa or India, he would know that his name was on the roll of his monastery, his success the object of the prayers of the community. If one member suffer, all the members would suffer with it; if one member be glorified, all the members would rejoice with it. In trouble, in persecution, in sickness, in failure, in temptation, ay, and in the event of a fall—a home would be open to each member, and the arms of a brotherhood would be extended to embrace and to protect him.

Thus much by way of suggestion towards the filling of a void in our present mechanism of Church work. We are very confident that in ten years brotherhoods will be dotted over the country, as numerous as are sisterhoods at present. We have not entered into the particulars of administration, for there may be diversities of administration, but the same Spirit; only we would urge upon those in whose power it is to mould such institutions, and to keep them within the bounds of prudence, by the mere extension to them of the right hand of fellowship, not to drive them into exaggeration, by acts of petty tyranny, nor to establish a breach, by aggression, where there might be union, and with union, a wondrous accession of strength.

SABINE BARING-GOULD.

On Hospital and Workhouse Nursing.

It may, perhaps, be laid down as a maxim of general application, that truth in principle must lead eventually to truth in practice; and if we apply this to questions in which the Church and the world take, as it were, an equal interest, or I ought rather to say, are equally involved, we should, perhaps, clothe the idea in some such phrase as this, viz., that high doctrine eventuates in, or leads on to, high practice. In other words, it may be asserted that dogma in the Church, assuming, as I believe I may assume, that dogma is synonymous with high doctrine, must, for this reason, and by virtue of a necessary connexion between the two, be productive of increased activity and zeal in works of mercy, charity, and love. I think I see something of the truth of this statement, when I look round upon the various institutions established in connexion with churches where high doctrine is taught. It seems as though the movement begun in the Church upwards of thirty years ago for the re-establishment of dogmatic truth had struck a sympathetic chord deep in the hearts of the people, and were even now vibrating through the land, producing its wonted fruits in new works of active benevolence.

It is not my present purpose to enlarge upon this topic; nor am I now concerned with its general application. What I wish to do is this—to direct attention to one particular work of mercy; because it appears to me to have, if I may so say, almost a prior claim upon the Church for its due performance; I allude to *the nursing of the sick poor*. And I believe I am fully justified in asking of Churchmen, and especially of Churchwomen, more consideration for this subject than, if we may judge by the way in which it is generally conducted, has yet been given to it.

It is well known, that in the earliest ages of Christianity the poor were pointedly taught to look to the Church for the relief of their bodily suffering; and to Catholic Christendom belongs the merit of having first established homes or hospitals for the nursing of the sick. The connexion of these institutions directly with the Church, at a time when her doctrine was of the purest, and when both it and the practice of her members in works of charity and love were unsullied by the blemishes which after-

wards crept over them, is a fact which ought not to be lost sight of in the present day. It seems, indeed, to suggest that there is a fitness in this association, that the poor who are specially committed to the Church's keeping, and notably so in their hour of suffering, who are taught to look to her as the source of very many, at least, of their earthly blessings, have a right to expect the proper fulfilment of this trust. And the poor well know that this is not the case, in too many instances, where a system (or rather a want of system) of what is called nursing is grudgingly given to them in the place of that which, springing from love, wins back love in return. There is, moreover, another reason why the Church, having, in obedience to the commands of her Divine Founder, originated this union between the hospital and herself, should now seek to maintain it. It is because the former is a harvest-field of work, so to speak, for her faithful sons and daughters. Though there was that in the Reformation for which we may well be thankful, we yet cannot look back upon that period without a feeling of profound regret for this among other reasons, viz., that it saw the severance of a connexion, which for centuries had worked so well for those for whose benefit it was instituted, the severance, I mean, of the hospital from the Church.

The loss was one which was felt both by those who ministered, and those who were ministered unto. Whether or not the system of nursing which was carried on in this country in the various conventual hospitals and other institutions for the cure of the sick, prior to the Reformation, was the best that could be devised, there is now no means to determine; but of this we may at any rate be sure, that it could not possibly be worse than, and in all probability it was infinitely superior to, that which has, until lately, been the fashion among us; and (as I shall endeavour to show hereafter) of which there are unfortunately but too many examples in the present day.

The mere fact that the Reformation has divorced the systematic care of the sick poor from the sheltering protection of the Church, and has handed over the whole profession of nursing to secular organization, is one much to be regretted. And it is mainly to this cause that the evils we have now to deplore are to be attributed. The absence of an abiding religious principle, the non-recognition of the true aim and object of suffering, and the inability to see that there are other and far higher rewards for the labourer who works in this vineyard, than those which are represented in current coin of the realm, albeit he or she is fairly entitled to this, and need not be altogether unmindful of it—these and the like considerations are no doubt the reasons of that

utter failure in the present system, which people are at length beginning to recognize.

I would not, however, have it understood that I am advocating any such intimate commingling of the Church and the hospital as is seen, for instance, in the Holy City itself; where not only does the Church direct and control all the details connected with the nursing of the sick, but the entire management of the hospitals is in fact ecclesiastical. So intimate is this union, that they would probably stand or fall together; and any unforeseen catastrophe affecting the temporalities of the Church, would so involve the resources of the hospital as to cut off its supplies, and what was originally intended for the relief of the sick, would be diverted into other channels. Such a system appears to me to be highly objectionable. But there is little fear of its being adopted in this country; and I need not, therefore, dwell longer on the subject. We, on the other hand, have gone to the opposite extreme. We have hardly cared to recognize the necessity for any religious element whatever in our care of the sick poor; certainly we have not inculcated it in our nursing organization. No doubt we have had plenty of kindly motive; there has been much of practical benevolence, and great zeal for the cure of disease, with but little thought for the healing of the soul. In a word, our one care has been for the natural body, forgetting, at the same time, that "there is a spiritual body."

Regarded only from a religious point of view, this would be objectionable enough, but it is yet more objectionable, if that be possible, when we know, as we assuredly may know, that such a system as this is detrimental even to those natural interests which we are so anxious to protect. Any one who has seen, as I have seen, hospital nursing under what I may term both the old and the new *régime*, examples of which I shall illustrate by and by, will bear me out in the remark, that the latter is far more conservative and economical of the powers of the patients, even to the saving of life, than the former. Indeed, if the object of nursing, apart from all religious considerations, be, as I suppose it is, to aid the physician in his efforts to combat disease, assuredly that system which is most intelligent, which, associated with high moral principle, substitutes regularity, order, obedience, watchfulness, patience, gentleness, and love, for sloth, self-will, passion, uncleanness, disobedience, covetousness, ay, even drunkenness and profligacy, must, in the end, accomplish its purpose much more certainly than any other.

It must be understood that in the foregoing remarks, my attention has been entirely directed to the subject of Hospital

Nursing; for the kind of attendance which is bestowed upon our sick poor in many workhouses cannot by any possibility be called nursing. It is a scandalous disgrace to this wealthy and professedly charitable nation; and, even at the best, is but a caricature of the worst form of hospital nursing, requiring, it is hoped, only to be generally known in order to ensure its immediate improvement. How that may best be done I shall endeavour to show hereafter.

But in order fully to understand the general scope of the subject, I shall consider it under the following heads:—

1. The amount—in the way of nursing—of work to be done.
2. The means at present employed for its execution.
3. Suggestions for its improvement.

Under the first head, I do not think I can give a better idea of the amount of nursing required, than by instancing a few statistical facts with reference to the various hospitals and workhouses in the United Kingdom.

I find that by the nearest calculation I am able to make, and I believe that my figures are fairly trustworthy, there are in London alone in the different *public* hospitals, asylums for the insane, dispensaries, and infirmaries, excluding the workhouses, which I shall notice presently, nearly 7000 beds. I may mention, in passing, that my calculations take no cognizance of any *private* homes, hospitals, or other institutions for the relief of the sick. I find, further, that in the provinces in England and in Wales there are about 12,000 more beds devoted to similar purposes. In Scotland the total number amounts to about 3500, and in Ireland there is a further number of 5000; making a grand total in the United Kingdom of about 27,500 beds.

What number of persons obtain relief every year from this enormous accommodation I am unable to say. But I suppose that, probably, each bed will receive on an average at least six or seven occupants in the course of twelve months, some more, some less; so that, probably, nearly 200,000 persons are thus brought under personal observation, and liable to be influenced for good or for evil by those to whose care they are for the time entrusted. When it is remembered that all this is the work of private charity, in the sense that it is independent of State assistance, and is only a portion of what is done for the sick poor, inasmuch as it takes no account of the hundreds of thousands relieved as out-patients, bearing in mind also that the average annual cost of maintaining a bed in a hospital is estimated at from 30*l.* to 35*l.* we may gain some idea of the vastness of the question involved in regard to the nursing organization.

We must not, however, suppose that our hospitals are the only nursing institutions in the country, the only places of refuge for the sick poor. On the contrary, large and important as they are, there are other establishments which, whatever may have been their original intention, have now become, to all intents and purposes, so many National or State hospitals. I refer, of course, to our *Workhouses*. Few people, probably, are aware of the extent to which these have become houses for the sick as well as refuges for the destitute; and it is sad, indeed, to think of the misery which is superadded to that of poverty, by the very inadequate means provided for the care of these poor suffering ones. Destitute often of the commonest necessaries of their condition, breathing an unwholesome atmosphere, contaminated by the very clothes that cover them, fed, or rather not fed, with food which they cannot eat, without a kind word to cheer them, with no sympathy in their distress, no gentle hand to smooth their pillow, no help from any but the hired servant, who does the least he can, it may be, only for a mess of pottage. Such, it is to be feared, is the lot of thousands of our brethren and sisters, shut up within the walls of our parish workhouses.

That this is no overdrawn picture, we might, I think, infer, even if it were not a matter of actual observation, by a consideration of the following facts. I have gathered them entirely from our metropolitan establishments, partly because, from official reports which have lately been made public concerning them, I am able to certify the correctness of the data, and partly because public attention has recently been very forcibly directed to them. I find, then, that in the forty-one houses within the metropolitan radius, there were on the 28th January, 1865, no less than 7685 sick persons, about 1500 of whom are described as "suffering under acute disorders," 250 from various forms of fever and zymotic disease; and exclusive of those in the sick wards, there were, at the time of the Report, upwards of 6500 "old and infirm males and females requiring the occasional attendance of the medical officer." The idea of their wanting a nurse or any other officer is not so much as hinted at. So that there is actually a larger number of sick poor, of persons requiring nursing attendance, in our metropolitan workhouses than in all our numerous London hospitals. What may be the aggregate number of the sick in the workhouses scattered about the country, I have no means of determining. I only know that it is estimated that there are generally about 600,000 persons shut up in the workhouses of Great Britain; in England alone there are 424 workhouse infirmaries, in Ireland 62, and in Wales 23; 509 in all. Scotland is

spared the disgrace which, in too many instances, attaches to the management of these institutions by having none to manage.

I do not of course mean to imply that the treatment which the poor receive in some of our workhouses is common to them all. I know of some cases wherein the management of the sick is quite as good as exists in many of our hospitals. Abstractedly, perhaps, this is not saying very much; but it is saying a great deal in the way of comparison. My object is rather to point out what people may see going on in some places if they will only take the trouble to look. All these institutions, I fear, need improvement, though some much more so than others; indeed, with not a few, the treatment of the sick is simply abominable.

Such, then, is the amount of work to be done in the way of nursing our sick poor. Let me now—in the second place—direct attention to the means at present employed for its execution, to appreciate which we shall find it convenient to institute a comparison between these two establishments—the hospital and the workhouse—both, as regards the persons confined in them, and also, as to the diseases under which they are suffering.

But first a few words may be needful as to the various systems of nursing extant among us. For practical purposes we may arrange them under three heads:—

1. Workhouse nursing.
2. Hospital nursing as it was.
3. Hospital nursing as it is—in places, I will add, where the new has been substituted for the old system.

These three classes represent what I propose to call the bad, the better, and the best arrangements for the care of the sick.

First, then, as to workhouse nursing. And here I must trouble the reader with a few more figures, as I think they will show, better than any statement of mine can show, how utterly disproportionate is the provision made to the work to be accomplished. I take my figures from the official documents before referred to; and in them I find that for the 7685 patients, who occupied 515 wards in the 41 workhouses, there were only 69 paid nurses, besides about 800 "pauper nurses and helpers." What the value of this latter class may be for the purpose to which they are applied, the reader will be able to judge for himself when I have given a description of them. Of the 69 paid nurses, 25 had had a training of some kind or other (in a few cases the training was very good) either in a metropolitan or provincial hospital. One only had been trained by a "Society of Nursing Sisters;" the rest had gained what knowledge they

possessed of their profession either in the workhouse to which they were attached or in some other workhouse.

On analyzing the distribution of these 69 paid nurses, I find that in 13 workhouses, containing an aggregate of 2064 patients, there was not a single paid or trained nurse of any kind. The whole of these poor people being entrusted, in their various sufferings, to "pauper nurses"—that is to say, to persons in the same destitute condition as themselves.

In 17 workhouses, containing in all 2060 patients, there was 1 paid nurse to each house.

In 5 workhouses, with a total of 1431 patients, there were 2 such nurses to each house.

In 3 workhouses, with 1166 patients, there were 3 to each house.

While in the remaining workhouses, containing severally 426, 313, and 225 patients, there were 4, 14, and 16 paid nurses respectively.

It is a common occurrence to find one paid nurse in nominal charge of one, two, three, and in one case, upwards of five hundred patients. Of course, it is hopeless to expect that any thing like a proper supervision of the "pauper nurses" can be maintained with such a staff as this. And as to there being any real nursing by the proper authorities, that is simply impossible. No wonder that we hear of things being done in the wards of workhouses which make one sick at heart, and many which excite a thrill of horror. Would that any thing I may write in these pages may excite in the hearts of my readers a determination not to rest content until such abuses are remedied. Were there any thing like an adequate supply of properly trained nurses, we should never have such abominations existing as are described in the following extracts from Reports lately published by "The *Lancet* Sanitary Commission for investigating the state of the Infirmaries of Workhouses." Speaking of the Bethnal Green Infirmary, which has lately become so painfully notorious, the Commissioners report :—

"In one ward we learnt that seventeen children were washed daily in one pail, several in the same water, and dried with the sheets. This was, we believe, the fault of the nurse, for she could have had towels if she had asked for them; but in a really well-managed house, the fact of her not drawing a proper supply of towels would have attracted attention."

No doubt it would. But as it is, the result is not surprising, though it is very disgraceful; for I find, on referring to the Parliamentary Report, that there are only two paid nurses to the

416 patients, in addition to 400 persons designated "old and infirm;" and that these nurses have never received any training whatever.

I have stated that, in some places, a better state of things has been inaugurated. The guardians seem to have recognized the fact, that the inmates of the house they are supposed to manage are really human beings; and that, as such, when ill, they require some sort of nursing, at least if they are to have any chance of recovering from their maladies. Accordingly, in the Mary-le-bone Workhouse, the sick wards of which contain 323 beds, besides the 500 or 600 chronically diseased persons who are lodged in the various infirm wards scattered throughout the house, I find that there are no less than 14 paid nurses. Many of these appear to have received fair hospital training; and they are said to perform their duty well, and to do their best to train the pauper nurses who are under their direction.

In another establishment, the S. Pancras Workhouse, a similar step has been taken. Here, according to the Report, "there were 232 inmates of the infirmary, 746 inmates of the infirm wards, and 116 insane, making a total of 1094 persons more or less under medical treatment;" in addition to which there is a maternity department and a nursery. For such an enormous hospital establishment as this, the public of course expects that there is an equally extensive medical staff, without which any system of nursing, however perfect, must be to some extent wasted. Yet what is the fact? Let the *Lancet* Commissioners answer the question:—

"If we take only the infirmary proper, and the insane department as under strictly medical charge, we have here a hospital which equals in size and importance such establishments as S. George's or the Middlesex Hospital (with a staff of fifteen or sixteen medical officers, besides the residents). Under these circumstances, the first question which an observer naturally asks is, Whether the guardians have provided a staff of medical officers and of skilled nurses, which in any way corresponds to the needs of an hospital of this size? The class of cases admitted to the infirmary and insane wards are the subjects of diseases very nearly as severe, and requiring as much and as continuous medical attention as those of any metropolitan hospital or county lunatic asylum (with the exception of the surgical department); and the combination of the two establishments under one roof renders the task of medical administration a singularly difficult and responsible one. What, then, is the strength of the medical staff? There are two resident medical officers to attend to the whole of these

enormously burdensome hospital duties, who are also charged with the care of the lying-in department, the 700 and odd infirm persons (many of whom are seriously ill), and the general medical superintendence of the house! That is to say, the medical staff is about one-fourth as large as would be tolerated for an instant by the managing committee of any charity for the sick which was open to the light of day, and the criticisms of the medical profession and the public."

It cannot be wondered at, therefore, if many things exist to the great detriment of the patient which ought not to be, and certainly would not be, if there were more time for examination. For instance, "There are only about four hand-basins for the washing purposes of each of the larger wards, containing about thirty-one patients." Again, in the nursery, where there are "thirty-six children crowded together in an unhealthy manner, the apartment smelt bad; and although the majority of the children were washed in this room, there was but one tub for them all, and no other convenience for ablution." There was also throughout all the wards "a great deficiency of towels;" but, it is added, "this neglect is the fault of the nurses only."

Notwithstanding all this, the nursing arrangements are, for a workhouse, unusually liberal. "Altogether, there are sixteen of these functionaries (paid and trained nurses), whose united salaries amount to about 340*l.* per annum. Their good influence is plainly visible in the general style of neatness and efficiency, comparatively speaking, which marks the nursing in this establishment; still it is only an instalment of what is urgently required to be done in this direction."

Now let us see, for a moment, what happens where the very reverse of any thing like liberal management obtains. In the Clerkenwell Workhouse "the sick, infirm, insane, and 'able-bodied' wards are jumbled side by side, and the whole place presents the dismal appearance of a prison hospital—not such as one meets with in civil life, but the sort of makeshift which might perhaps be seen in a garrison town in war time, except that in the latter situation one would not be annoyed by the shrieks and laughter of noisy lunatics—one of the special features of the Clerkenwell establishment." As regards the number of inmates, I find that out of about 560 persons which the house contains when full, 250 are sick, and 280 infirm, including about 80 insane. These are entrusted to the care of one paid nurse, who is described as "an experienced and valuable woman," who exercises as much supervision as is possible over "the incapable paupers who do the real bulk of the nursing;" and disgraceful indeed it

must be, to allow of the discovery that "the disgusting practice of washing in the 'chambers' was carried on in several of the infirm wards."

But if any thing were needed to fill the cup of horrors which this supposed "House of Charity" presents, it would surely be seen in the picture thus described by an eye-witness:—

"Perhaps the most painful consequence of the inefficient lodgement which the house affords to its motley population, is the impossibility of classification, even where this is most urgently needed. The arrangements for the insane afford a shocking example of this. Such a spectacle as is presented by the two wards in which the more serious of the male and female insane cases are treated, is not often to be seen in these days of enlightened management of such cases. The women's ward, in particular, offers an instance of thoughtless cruelty, which nothing can excuse the Guardians for permitting. Twenty-one patients live entirely in this ward, which affords them an allowance of only 459 cubic feet each (I may mention that all competent authorities fix 1500 cubic feet as the proper space requisite for each person); and the mixture of heterogeneous cases which ought never to be mingled is really frightful. There is no seclusion ward for acute maniacs; and, accordingly, we saw a poor wretch who had for five days been confined to her bed by means of a strait-waistcoat, during the whole of which time she had been raving and talking nonsense, having only had two hours' sleep, and there was the prospect of her remaining several days longer in the same condition. There were several epileptics in the ward, and one of them had a fit while we were present; and there were imbeciles and demented watching all this with curious, half-frightened looks, which said very plainly how injurious the whole scene must be to them."

It seems scarcely credible that such a state of things as this could exist in the very heart of one of the richest, most enlightened, and most charitable cities in the world; and this, too, be it remembered, in a house devoted to works of mercy, charity, and love. It seems a profanation even to hint at such purposes in connexion with scenes like this. Unfortunately this is by no means an isolated case; and as the reports whence these extracts are made are not likely to be read so extensively as their importance demands, from being published in a medical journal, I may be excused, I hope, for quoting a parallel case in another of these dens of mismanagement.

Speaking of the Bethnal Green Infirmary, it is said that—

"The responsible work of nursing the sick, 550 to 600 in number, is committed to the care of two paid nurses, who receive

30*l.* and 24*l.* a year respectively, and about forty pauper nurses and helpers. Neither of these paid officials has been trained, but both displayed considerable aptitude for their duties. On being questioned as to the amount of work, both said they had more to do than they could get through, independently of the difficulty of managing forty pauper nurses, whose tendencies to drink cannot be controlled.

"A better example could not be taken of the bad state of the nursing in these houses, than that which is offered by the male insane ward. The ward itself, be it said, *en passant*, is a disgrace to the institution; and its continued use for the lodgment of demented patients ought not to be tolerated. Small, dark, ill ventilated, and with no outlook, the rooms are utterly unfitted for the purpose. One patient had been there six weeks, another five weeks, and one a fortnight. The ward was under the charge of a male pauper, a weaver by trade, who had no knowledge of nursing, and was waiting for the fine weather to resume his occupation. He had left the ward temporarily under the charge of a female nurse (also a pauper), to whom a noisy lunatic was addressing extravagant terms of endearment. Patients such as this ought not to be retained in the house. The wards may do as a lock-up for a night; but as an 'insane department' they are scandalously bad, and confinement in them for two or three weeks must have the worst effect upon the mental malady of the unhappy patients."

Another very reprehensible practice which is adopted in these London workhouses, with but few exceptions, is that of leaving the wards entirely unattended during the night. When it is remembered that the regulation "night" lasts from about eight or nine in the evening till seven o'clock next morning, the necessity for some attendance at least is evident. Indeed, in many cases, and in all those which are called "acute," proper nursing is required as much by night as by day. Medicine and food, or drink, may in fact be more urgently needed; for every one knows, except those who most require to know, viz., "pauper nurses," that the night hours are often the most critical in such cases as fever and acute inflammations. It may be, that those who superintend the nursing arrangements of a workhouse are careless on this matter, because they know that it is futile to expect a pauper nurse to keep awake; while the idea of trusting her with any thing of the nature of a stimulant for administration to the patients, would be more charming for its simplicity than wise or politic either for herself or the patient. This is a matter, therefore, which most urgently calls for reform. It is but recently

that the public have been scandalized by the inquiries which have taken place regarding the deaths of two paupers which occurred in the night, when no nurse was near to attend to them. But the heart sickens at the thought of the many sad stories which might be told of the cruelties—they can be called by no other name—practised in these "Homes of the Poor," as they have been sarcastically called. Indeed, I cannot conceive a better specimen of utter incapacity, a more complete disproportion between the means and the end, than is to be found in the case of a pauper nurse and the duties entrusted to her. Old, infirm, unclean, often immoral, seldom temperate in any thing, never, as a rule, temperate in drink, idle, careless, utterly inexperienced in all that relates to her appointment, selfish, cruel, and tyrannical, destitute of any religious principle, with not one single qualification for her office, but with every disqualification, the pauper nurse is the very last person in the world one would wish to see placed in such a trust. It is marvellous how any such system could have been commenced. There is no parallel to it in any other walk of life; and nothing but the system of secrecy in which the so-called "Guardians" manage to enshrine themselves would have allowed this state of things to exist for a single month.

It is rare to find one of these nurses under 50 years of age, many are 70, and some upwards of 80 years old. Years ago Mrs. Jameson has said, "I recollect seeing, in a provincial workhouse, a ward in which were ten old women, all helpless and bedridden; to nurse these, was a decrepit old woman of 70, lean, and withered, and feeble; and her assistant was a girl with one blind eye, and scarcely able to see with the other. In a ward where I found eight paralyzed old women, the nurse being equally aged, the helper was a girl who had lost the use of one hand. Only the other day I saw a pauper nurse in a sick ward who had a wooden leg. I remember no cheerful faces; when the features and deportment were not debased by drunkenness, or stupidity, or ill-humour, they were melancholy, or sullen, or bloated, or harsh: and *these are the sisters of charity to whom our sick poor are confided.*" I cannot refrain from italicizing these last words, they seem so exactly to touch the foul spot in this system. One matron says that since, from economical impulses, the Guardians in the house she presided over had cut off the monthly allowance of one shilling to the pauper nurses, she has lost even the little hold she formerly had upon them, in that she cannot now threaten them with the loss of that allowance! And this is the value at which the Guardians themselves estimate the miserable services these "nurses" render, and the importance they attach to the nursing

care of their sick inmates. No wonder the patients often hate, instead of love, their nurses. If this be the object of their service, can we wonder at the fact that "they all drink; whenever it is their turn to go out for a few hours, they come back intoxicated, and have to be put to bed?" It would be bad enough, indeed, to have as nurses women who, from age and infirmity, and an entire absence of any thing like professional experience in nursing, are utterly incompetent for the work they are called upon to do. But added to all this there is not only the possibility, but even the probability, of their being immoral and profligate, who, instead of being a pattern to those under them of sobriety, gentleness, patience, and goodness, are, on the contrary, too frequently examples of all that one would most like not to see in any one, and least of all in a woman.

Such then is in the great majority of instances, at least in our metropolitan workhouses, the general system of ward (mis)management which goes by the name of "nursing;" a title to which it certainly cannot lay the smallest claim. I wish it to be distinctly understood that what I have said refers entirely to workhouses in London. And though I know that all are not alike in this respect, that some are really making an attempt at improvement, yet it must be admitted that this is very exceptional, and even where an improvement is attempted, the indications are too plain that the spirit of vestrydom will only yield to severe pressure, and that common sense, common justice, and the merest dictates of humanity will have a hard and, it may be, an unequal struggle against the contemptible meanness, the stolid indifference, and may I not say positive cruelty, of some of our mis-named Guardians of the Poor.

Possibly in the country workhouses things are differently managed. In many instances I know that such is the case; they are at least free from the glaring abominations which are to be met with in London. Still, it must be confessed, they are by no means so perfect in their hospital and nursing arrangements as they might and ought to be. I know of one instance, certainly, in a small country town, where the general conduct of the workhouse infirmary leaves but little to be desired. There is cleanliness, order, kindness, and a fair share of attention. There might certainly, with advantage, be more of the religious element, and there are minor matters of detail which any one accustomed to good hospital management would wish to see altered. I know also of another instance in a large provincial town, that of Manchester, to which I shall refer by and by, where a step has really been made in what I will call the right direction. And these

changes have been introduced in such a large-hearted way as to ensure to the Guardians all the comfort and satisfaction derivable from the consciousness of having done their duty to the poor. Why the good example which is here and there apparent is not more generally followed, it is, perhaps, difficult to point out. The reason in one instance may not be the same in another. Even in London it is possible that there may be something like an approach to order, cleanliness, and even cheerfulness, witness the following in reference to the Islington Workhouse:—

"The infirmary accommodates 150 patients. The medical officer visits daily. There is a resident dispenser, and the guardians provide the drugs. Thus there are the best elements of successful medical care. Within the wards are found prescription and diet cards, properly written, over each bed. The wards, low, small, and ill lighted as they were, have yet an aspect of cheerfulness and comfort. The walls were coloured cheerfully. There were prints hanging on the walls, and a few ornaments about the fire-place. In every window were a few flower-pots or flower-boxes. The linen was very clean, for here two clean sheets are allowed per week. Every ward had a full supply of bed-rests for bedridden patients, who could thus be propped up in bed. At the end of each ward was its clean and shining array of stomach and foot warmers for three or four aged and sick persons. Each ward had its proportion of shawls for the use of the sick in cold weather. The patients were very cheerful, very grateful, and much better kept, as to their faces and hair, and their personal linen, than is often seen. In every case they had had their medicines regularly. The dressings were well applied. Sore backs were unknown as arising in the house, and we examined paralyzed and speechless patients, who had been bedridden for years, and found them clean, comfortable, and with unspotted skin. . . . We observed two little details which speak volumes for the good order and cleanliness of the house, and the proper spirit which animates its managers. Every ward has a supply of small dinner-cloths for use when the patients are bedridden. These little cloths being spread, save the bed from grease, and give an air of comfort to the dinner arrangements. Besides these, each ward is provided with a number of squares of light muslin, which, being thrown over the faces of bedridden patients, protect them in hot weather from flies, &c."

Now, considering how very little, either of labour or money all this costs, is it not surprising that it should be so exceptional? A few pounds spent in this way is certainly not wasted; for there is no class of people more susceptible of kindness, none

who can more truly appreciate little acts of benevolence and kindly feeling, than the majority of the sick inmates of our workhouses. I speak this from experience. Equally true is it, that treatment of an opposite kind produces very contrary effects. Nor is this at all to be wondered at; for the poor sufficiently know the object and purpose of the Poor Law, to feel that the State never intended them to be treated in the way previously described. They know and feel that there is neglect of duty somewhere, and it is useless to expect of them the exercise of any very high principle when such examples are the only ones held out for imitation. Either the Guardians have a duty to perform towards the poor, or they have not. If they have, it assuredly is not discharged by any such violation of the commonest instincts of our humanity as is perpetrated in the following system. This time it is the Shoreditch establishment which is the subject of comment. The Commissioners remark:—

"The next part of inquiry was to the regularity of the administration of food and medicines. Medicines are administered in this house with shameful irregularity. The result of our inquiries showed, that of nine consecutive patients, only four were receiving their medicines regularly. A poor fellow lying very dangerously ill with gangrene of the leg, had had no medicine for three days, because, as the male 'nurse' said, his mouth had been sore. The doctor had not been made acquainted either with the fact that the man's mouth was sore, or that he had not had the medicines ordered for him. A female, also very ill, had not had her medicine for two days, because the very infirm old lady in the next bed, who, it seemed, was appointed by the nurse to fulfil this duty, had been too completely bedridden for the last few days to rise and give it to her. Other patients had not had their medicines because they had diarrhœa; but the suspension had not been made known to the doctor, nor had medicine been given to them for their diarrhœa. The nurses generally had the most imperfect idea of their duties in this respect. One nurse plainly avowed, that she gave medicines three times a day to those who were very ill, and twice or once a day as they improved. The medicines were given all down a ward in a cup; elsewhere in a gallipot. The nurse said she 'poured out the medicine, and judged according.' In other respects the nursing was equally deficient. The dressings were roughly and badly applied. Lotions and water-dressings were applied in rags, which were allowed to dry and stick. We saw sloughing ulcers and cancer so treated. In fact this was the rule. Bandages seemed to be unknown. But the general character of the nursing will be

appreciated by the detail of the one fact, that we found in one ward two paralytic patients with frightful sloughs on the back. They were both dirty, and lying on hard straw mattresses; the one dressed only with a rag steeped in chloride-of-lime solution; the other with a rag thickly covered with ointment. This latter was a fearful and very extensive sore, in a state of absolute putridity; the buttocks of the patient were covered with filth, and excoriated, and the stench was masked by strewing dry chloride of lime on the floor under the bed. A spectacle more saddening or more discreditable cannot be imagined. Both these patients have since died; no inquest has been held on either."

It is really impossible to find a reason for all this, and difficult even to obtain an explanation, unless it lies hid somewhere in the fact that there are Guardians in existence who can write, in reference to the condition of the house, such reports as the following in the Visitors' Book. It is unnecessary, perhaps, for me to mention the name of the workhouse; but I can vouch for the accuracy of the quotations, as they come to me from an unimpeachable source. One gentleman describes the state of the house as "*verey* good." Elsewhere it is described more emphatically as "*verry* good." In one place we learn that all "*appeors*" quiet; elsewhere "all serene." Occasionally we find "*yeas*" as an affirmative entry. And in answer to the printed question, "Are the lunatics quiet?" is the reply, "Yes, they *hare*." These are but specimens; and they indicate, I think, that at that workhouse at least, ignorance may be answerable for a great part of the evils attendant upon the present system. It will be obvious to any one, that no gentleman would for a moment sanction such habits as I have described; and here we have evidence, that persons who are utterly unfitted to govern, are placed in positions of great responsibility, having duties to perform which require much tact, kindly disposition, and intelligent zeal. Can we wonder that the whole scheme is one gigantic failure?

Let us now see how the subject of nursing fares in our hospitals. The lesson is a profitable one by way of contrast to that we have been considering. I have previously stated that there is what I have called a "better" and a "best" system of hospital nursing. The former is unfortunately the more common of the two, and, regarded merely from a nursing point of view, may, I suppose, be so cultivated as to approximate very closely to the mere nursing value of the latter system. Indeed, I know of many hospitals where the nursing, under what may be called the old *régime*, is extremely good. But there is in the modern

system, superadded to its merely nursing qualities, an element so subtle, that it is rather felt than seen; so penetrating, that even the heart of stone unwittingly yields to its softening influence; so tender, yet so powerful; so full of sympathy for others, and yet so lost to self. It is the element of Christian charity.

Most of us, I suppose, are pretty well acquainted with the character of Mrs. Gamp. At the time when that sketch was written, such a specimen was not uncommon. Happily, it is much more uncommon now, though there is still room for improvement. At one time no one seemed to know what was really good nursing. We have learnt it now, and are not likely to forget the lesson. We are beginning to understand that it takes a great deal more to make a good nurse than we had given them credit for. On this subject I shall have more to say hereafter.

It is difficult to institute a comparison between workhouse and hospital nursing, inasmuch as the comparison is between systems widely dissimilar. At no point does the former touch the "best" examples of the latter. In the "better" specimens of the hospital system, the nurses do bear a certain general resemblance to the "paid nurses" of the workhouse. But a really good nurse, trained under the modern *régime*, would scout the idea of any Metropolitan Poor Law appointment. And rightly so; for the maxim *noscitur a sociis*, applied under such circumstances, would certainly amount to a defamation of character. This would hardly be true of the older race of hospital nurses, or of those still among us, unfortunately in too great numbers, where the old system prevails. Under that system a nurse might take to her calling at almost any age. She would probably be between thirty and forty when she began. She might be as ignorant as the heathen, and she very likely would have a rather strong partiality for the more ardent liquors. She would be fat, rough in manner, harsh in speech, vulgar in dress, self-satisfied, indolent, not too clean either in person or habits, and if she thought of religion at all, it would most likely be in the spirit of the publican. Her services she would estimate for their money value, taking care not to give more than the *quid pro quo*, and probably would use her wages in mere sensual gratification. Such, it is to be feared, were the more salient features in the character of the hospital nurse in former days, some specimens of which are still extant.

In a hospital nursed by such people we should probably find an average of one nurse to ten or fifteen beds, who had sole charge of her ward, with perhaps a helper to do the scrubbing

and heavier portion of the work. There would be no one placed over her except the matron, who, however, generally knows nothing of nursing; so that, practically, the nurse, under this system, is responsible to no one. Accordingly, inattention, uncleanness, the absence of high moral and religious principle, a want of sympathy, tenderness, and kindly regard, with occasionally evils of a more positive character, such as drunkenness, levity of conduct, evil temper, amounting at times to treatment little short of cruel—these, and whatever flows from them, were and are among the more frequent complaints attendant upon the old system, where special training was never thought of, and women of education and religious principle regarded as something decidedly *infra dig.* the calling of a hospital nurse.

It can hardly be said that this quality of nurse ever gave satisfaction. She was regarded rather as a being whom it was necessary to have, but no one ever thought of deriving much comfort or benefit from her services. If skill of a certain kind were obtainable, it was almost certain to be at the cost of social qualities scarcely less desirable.

How different is the nurse of modern days! And why? One word explains it all, it is *training.* There is a professional training as necessary for the fully-qualified nurse as are lessons in cookery for the cook, or as apprenticeships for various kinds of handicraft. But, in addition to this training, something more is needed. It will not suffice for a nurse to be content with what she is taught; she also must learn for herself. Above all, she must diligently cultivate habits of careful observation. There must be, to start with, a fair share of natural ability, good useful education, genuine love of her special calling, kindness, gentleness, meekness, patience, and a heartfelt appreciation of the aim and object of suffering. Thus out of a pure conscience she may minister to the sin-stricken soul while she tends the suffering body.

For the perfecting of such a work, early training is indispensable, and that training must be of a special kind; not from books and lectures, for no one was ever made a good nurse by merely reading a book or hearing a lecture. Many matters which form the groundwork of good nursing may well be learnt in a course of lectures; *e. g.*, popular illustrations of the structure of the human body, of the relations of its several organs to one another, the mode of performing their several functions, and the importance of each in the animal economy; a sketch of the classification of remedies, and of their *modus operandi;* above all, some general idea of the laws of health, and the nature of their

disturbance in the production of disease. A few lectures on subjects such as these will be found invaluable to the well-trained nurse, they will make all the difference between intelligent service and blind routine, and as a groundwork for clinical or bedside observation their importance cannot be over-estimated. In acute disease, especially, such knowledge as this may make all the difference between the life and death of the patient: for the nurse who knows her work well, may see indications of approaching mischief, which, to the uneducated, would pass unnoticed, and thus the time for active interference might pass away beyond the hope of recall. Is then no importance to be attached to such a training as this? Who can tell how many lives have passed away for want of such a witness?

I have said that *early* training is very necessary; and herein is one important distinction between the nurse of the old and the new *régimes*. The former probably seeks the situation of a nurse when she has almost passed the age of instruction, and without any previous study of her vocation; possibly she comes to it only as a last resource when other schemes have failed. The latter generally enters before the age of five-and-twenty, seldom after five-and-thirty. She feels a special fitness for the work, and looks to it as to a profession requiring patient study. She knows that many months must pass before she can be qualified for such responsibility, and conscience warns her not to trifle in a matter so momentous. Above all, she feels a sacred duty in the work she takes in hand.

In one of the oldest and best of the training institutions for nurses, six months are required, and twelve are recommended to be spent in the capacity of a probationer, before the applicant is considered to be qualified as a nurse. Before admission to the probation, she must produce certificates of age, of being a communicant, of good moral character, and of good health, together with the particulars of her employment and residence during the preceding five years. During the probation, all of which is spent in a hospital, the applicant attends lectures on professional subjects, and is otherwise instructed in the practical work of nursing, while at the same time her mind is being well stored with sound religious instruction. After her period of probation, she is either sent to private nursing, or she may be placed in charge of a ward in the hospital.

This, briefly, is the training to which the nurses of S. John's House are submitted at King's College Hospital, and a similar system is, I believe, pursued at University College Hospital, in the case of the nurses belonging to the All Saints' Home. But

that which gives the distinctive and superior character to the nurses of these and similar institutions, is their association with the voluntary self-sacrificing service of ladies whose influence, as Sisters of Charity, cannot be other than beneficial to them as individuals, and especially so as nurses.

The element to which I have just alluded, that of a band of voluntary associates, be they sisters, deaconesses, or ladies with no such vocation, does not exist in every training institution;-and many may think it is not a necessary or even a desirable adjunct. On this question I shall have somewhat more to say shortly, but what I want the reader specially to notice, is, that the modern system of hospital nursing, that which experience has proved to be the best, asserts the absolute necessity for special training in all those who undertake the duties and responsibilities of a sick nurse, whether that nurse be employed in a workhouse, in a hospital, or in a private family. And this opinion is, moreover, accepted and acted upon by the public at large; from whom the demands for private nursing made upon those institutions, where such nurses are known to be trained, is many hundred times greater than can be supplied by the existing staffs.

But not only is the quality of the individual nurses created by the new system vastly superior to the old, the quantity also allotted to a given number of patients shows the importance which the heads of nursing establishments attach to the profession of a nurse, the good which experience has taught them may be done by closer attention to the patients, and the evils which necessarily result from inadequate attendance on the sick. This will be strikingly seen, if we compare the practice of the workhouse and the hospital. As before stated, there were to the 7685 sick paupers in our metropolitan workhouses, 69 paid nurses, about one-third of whom had received some kind of hospital training, and upwards of 800 "pauper nurses and helpers," of the kind I have already described. Of these latter about 250 were "helpers," that is, persons who scrub the floors, and do all that kind of work which the best-trained nurses are relieved from doing. Thus we get about 550 "pauper nurses," such as they are, and 69 paid nurses, to 7685 patients, 1500 of whom were suffering under acute diseases; whilst there were in addition 6550 old and infirm paupers, who though they only required occasional visits from the doctor, certainly required some amount of nursing attendance, at least if they are at all like the old and infirm who happily are not compelled to live in the workhouse. Excluding these, however, from present calculation, we arrive, by a simple process of division, at this result, that, in the opinion of our so-called "Guar-

dians of the Poor" one "paid nurse" and about twelve "pauper nurses" are sufficient to perform all the nursing necessary for about 150 patients.

Now for the contrast. King's College Hospital contains the same number of beds; and I am indebted to the Lady Superior of S. John's House, under whom all the nursing of that institution is conducted, for the following statement. The number of professional nurses is 23; that of probationers, 17; these are assisted and superintended in their more important nursing functions by about 6 ladies as Sisters of Charity, making an effective total of 46. When the quality of these Sisters and nurses is compared with the very raw material used in the workhouse infirmary, the contrast is made still more striking. Indeed, from what I personally know, I am satisfied that *one* trained nurse, such as I have described, would add tenfold to the comfort of the 150 patients nursed by the *twelve* "pauper nurses."

In another hospital, that attached to University College, the number of beds is about 120, and the nursing is managed entirely by the Superior of the All Saints' Home, to whom I am also indebted for the information, that the average number of trained nurses and probationers varies from 20 to 25, and that they are assisted and superintended by 7 Sisters, making a total of from 27 to 32—a proportion differing but little from that of King's College Hospital.

These are, so far as I know, the only hospitals in England where this system of nursing is carried out. Something of the same kind is being tried at S. Thomas's Hospital, under the direction of the Trustees of the Nightingale Fund. This case, however, differs in the important particular, that there are no Sisters of Charity in connexion with it; and this, of course, alters its whole character. Still, the nurses receive there a good training, with the object of fitting them for situations of responsibility in other parts of the country. In other of our large hospitals, great care is taken to select fitting candidates for nursing, and they are trained for a certain time under the more experienced nurses, or "Sisters," as they are called. These Sisters are, however, only a class of elder nurse, and have no kind of resemblance to the Sisters of Charity, such as we understand the term. Regarded merely as nurses, they are doubtless, in many cases, very efficient; but their service is not voluntary, and they do not pretend to any distinctly religious character. They are placed in charge of one or more wards, having nurses or probationers under them; and they are responsible for the proper nursing of the —

ward, and for carrying out the instructions of the medical officers. The matron of the hospital generally appoints both the "Sisters" and the nurses; and she is, in fact, the head of all the female workers of the house.

In the majority of hospitals where this system is carried out, the nurses have also to undertake the scrubbing of the floors, &c., and in many cases they have to take their turn of the night duty, there being no regular staff of night nurses. Under the former system this is otherwise ordered, separate nurses being told off for night duty: for as the patients are for the most part asleep, except the more acute cases, the nursing required is in some respects inferior, both in kind and degree, to that of a day nurse.

The time is probably past, when any very bad nursing, such as was not uncommon long ago, would be tolerated in our hospitals. A nurse, for instance, who is an unquestionable drunkard, would find it no easy matter to get a situation in the present day. Formerly, she had little to fear, because she knew she was not much, if any worse than her compeers, and, therefore, dismissal was not a very potent remedy. But though we may have risen somewhat in the moral scale, I question whether, as regards the majority of our hospitals, both in town and country, we have advanced as much as we ought to have done in the general conduct of our nursing; whether, apart from this supposed improvement in morals, the majority of our nurses are more skilful, more experienced, or have a more perfect appreciation of all the details of nursing arrangements than had their sisters of the past half century. At any rate, if they have, they are still very far short of our best models; and what improvement there may be is most likely due to the very high standard assumed by our proper Training Institutions.

The questions for consideration then, are, with the admitted evils in our workhouse system, and the acknowledged deficiencies in our hospitals: How can we raise the moral tone of the nursing of the country? And how can we render it more efficient in its merely nursing qualities? To each of these questions very satisfactory and, I believe, conclusive answers can be given. And, remember, it is not the poor only who have an interest in this question. Sickness, disease, and death, are common to all classes of the community, rich and poor alike. We therefore have something at stake in this matter; and in doing our best to raise up a body of women skilled in all that tends to the comfort of the *wards*, we are at the same time preparing for ourselves helpers, who in our last hour may bring to us comforts greater than even wealth can purchase. Moreover, if, as I hope to prove, the association of the paid and trained nurse with the voluntary oblation of the educated, refined,

and spiritualized Sister of Charity, not only perfects the education of the former, but utilizes in the best possible way the otherwise wasted energies of our superabundant female population, especially among the middle and upper classes, have we not here an additional reason for giving this subject our most serious and unprejudiced consideration? I am satisfied that if all the energy and all the talk which we have heard of late years about the rights of women had been devoted to this great work of mercy, we should not only have turned to good account the tender sympathies which, it may be, have been wasted in less fitting channels, but we should also by this time have leavened the whole of our nursing organization with an element which alone can raise it to its true dignity, as a helper in the work of the Church.

It is, I repeat, nothing short of a calamity, that at present the Church, in her corporate capacity, takes little or no cognizance of the claims which the sick poor have upon her. She proposes no plan, which she certainly might be fairly expected to do, for the better and more systematic attendance upon the sick; and she therefore misses the opportunity thus open to her, of directing into proper channels the love and devotion of her faithful children. Of course, as a consequence of all this, we have to endure the evils of mere secular organization, and, as might be expected, the result is a failure, at least in its more important particulars. Proper nursing, in its best and highest aspect, is so nearly related to the once Divine "gift of healing," that we might as soon expect the unlearned and ignorant to be skilled in this mystery, as that a "nurse" should be able to exercise her functions aright without any previous training or professional education.

Where then is the remedy? It is within the reach of all. Those who will, may see it in operation and judge for themselves: those who can, may help in it if they will. There is surely work enough, and more than enough to be done. Our workhouses need it; our hospitals need it; our villages and parochial districts need it; our private families need it. We want our young women by thousands for nurses; we want our ladies by hundreds for Sisters. Surely some of the half million of women who are in excess of our male population, and are said to have no occupation, might come forward and find a fitting employment here. Experience has taught us beyond dispute, what indeed we might *a priori* have imagined, that the most perfect system of nursing which has yet been devised is that where the paid nurse of comparatively low degree is associated with the higher order of mind met with in the Sister of Charity, whose life of devotion to the service of her LORD, her purity and refinement of thought, the spirituality

which surrounds her every action, the entire self-denial of her daily life, and the consciousness excited in those who see her that all this is done for the love of GOD: such an atmosphere as this cannot but influence for good those who come within its reach, whether they be nurse or patient; and the more intimate the association, the more perfect will be the reflection. It is a rule which follows in every walk in life. "Evil communications corrupt good manners" is not more true than its converse. It would be hard indeed, if nought but evil could be learnt by example and contact.

This is no idle or fanciful theory, but an acknowledged fact among those who have had experience in the matter. The harsh, uncouth, vulgar manner of the woman who has all her life long associated only with persons of low rank and little education, softens and refines by mere contact with the higher order of mind. Only let mind have its way, and its superiority over matter will in the end be apparent. Vulgarity is but a species of sensuality: and sensuality is the triumph of the flesh over the spirit.

It need not be thought that the poor of our workhouses and hospitals do not require this measure of refinement, because they cannot appreciate it. Both these statements are wrong. They do appreciate it most fully; and few require it more. At the time of sickness they are peculiarly subject to its influence; and its effect in elevating their character and in purifying their moral sense, is well known to all who have watched it. The force of example, subtle though it be, is far more powerful than people commonly suppose. Like the water which, all unperceived, steals into the crack of the embankment, its presence there is only known when its hydraulic power is felt.

But it may be asked, Why should the voluntary unpaid service be necessarily that of a Sister of Mercy? Why not have a number of ladies, like the parochial district visitors, to superintend the nursing and to bring their influence to bear upon the work in hand? Such a scheme would, in my opinion, be certainly futile, and would, I believe, crumble to pieces by its inherent weakness. There must be a recognized head, a definite rule, and a common bond such as has never yet been found among district visitors. Bishop Forbes has well said—"Any clergyman who has had experience in these things will be able to tell the many inconveniences, the jealousies, the uncertainties, the wilfulnesses that attend the present system of district visiting. Even where these features do not show themselves, the total want of training and method consequent upon it must make itself felt. Very often

the zealous temperament which nerves devoted people to undertake those holy labours is accompanied by great lack of discretion, and so their exertions really injure rather than benefit. At best, their efforts want that habitual denial of self and self-will, which does so open the mind to the gentle influence of GOD the HOLY GHOST, casting out all which may deafen the inward ear to His lowest whispers."

It is not my province now to enter into any general argument for or against the institution of Sisterhoods. All I am contending for is this, that if we would heighten the moral character of our nursing organization, with the double object of benefiting both the nurses and the patients, we can only do so by the introduction of the voluntary unpaid element, the motor force of which springs from a yearning desire to give glory to GOD in the highest, on earth peace, good will towards men. It is "the entire self-devotion of one who visits the sick as visiting CHRIST, and is, out of her deep love and sympathy, alive to every want of soul or body of those once made members of CHRIST," that alone can raise the practice of nursing to its proper rank and usefulness.

But in doing so we not only accomplish this purpose, we also, by reason of the necessary connexion of high principle with high practice, pointed out in the beginning of this Essay, raise and improve the character of the nursing, considered merely in its professional aspect. The great care which is taken by the authorities of S. John's House to secure none but women of high moral character, respectability, and education, is proof of their endeavour in one direction, while the pains taken to give them sound practical instruction by lecture, demonstration, and bedside study during the six, nine, or twelve months they are undergoing their period of probation, is equal evidence in the other direction. Of course there is no reason why such professional training should not be given in a purely secular as well as a distinctly religious institution. But, as a matter of fact, except in the case of the Nightingale training establishment, no such efforts, so far as I know, are made for the proper hospital training of our nurses.

For the system of nursing here advocated we have the high authority of Miss Nightingale, who says—"Where the nurses belong to a religious order, and are under their own spiritual head, the hospital, being administered by a separate and secular governing body, is, on the whole, *best calculated to secure good nursing for the sick, and the general well-being of both patients and nurses.*" The italics are my own, as those words seem to me to yield the whole pith of the matter. The *next* best system Miss Nightingale considers to be that wherein the nurses are secular, under their

own secular female head, the hospital having its own separate and secular government.

This no doubt is the *next* best. But those who agree with me in thinking that the poor have a claim upon the Church in this matter, and that they may naturally look to her to tend and care for their bodies as well as their souls in times of sickness, will, of course, re-echo Miss Nightingale's opinion that the former is *the best;* and they will also, I hope, not rest content with any thing short of *the best.*

There is one objection which is so constantly brought forward against the employment of religious orders in the nursing of the sick, that it is necessary I should say a few words upon it. It is said, that they care a great deal more to prepare the sick for death, than to see them restored to health. I cannot say I think there is much, though I certainly believe there is some, force in this objection. The continued habit of self-denial naturally leads, I think, to some depreciation of the value of this life, in exact proportion as it fixes the thoughts and hopes on that which is to come. But inasmuch as the secular element errs rather in the opposite direction, the remedy would seem to lie in the due admixture of this with the religious; and this is amply provided for by the constitution and government of all our public medical charities.

One other objection to religious orders for nursing I may notice in passing. It is thought that in some matters where the directions of the head of the "order" are opposed to those of the doctors, the Sister will follow the former instead of the latter, and so lead to confusion. I fear there may be some grounds for this objection; indeed, I have known instances of its occurrence, and were they at all frequent, the results could not be otherwise than deplorable. But the occasions on which any collision of this kind would be likely to arise must be very rare; and if each one concerned will keep to his and her proper sphere of work, they are not likely to occur at all. "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing," and the head of an Order of nursing Sisters is very apt to think that, on some strictly professional matter, her reading or knowledge entitles her to an opinion equal with that of the constituted authority. I cannot refrain from offering one word of caution here—all the more necessary if there be, as I hope there may be, some chance that this system of nursing will extend throughout the country. Obedience to properly constituted authority is, I believe, a cardinal point among religious orders. Let these see to it, then, that there is no interference with the directions of the doctors in any matter relating to the treatment of the sick. A nurse or Sister is, in duty, bound to obey the

physician's directions without reference to her spiritual head. The fault, therefore, of any collision between these two authorities must necessarily lay at the door of the latter; and should the idea once gain ground that there is any danger of such a collision, all hope of an extension of this system will be frustrated by the influence of the medical profession.

There is an interesting question which, I am sorry to say, I have not time to do more than hint at; viz., the propriety of introducing religious orders of men as a part of any system of nursing organization, giving to them the charge of the male patients. In the hospitals and other establishments for the care of the sick prior to the Reformation, these brotherhoods played a very important part; and it is remarkable that, after the suppression of those institutions, no attempt should have been made towards the employment of men in our hospitals, either as religious or secular orders. One would think that there is very much in the male wards of our hospitals and workhouses which men of a religious habit might very appropriately do; and that, moreover, the influence which these persons, as brethren trained with special reference to this vocation, imbued with a deep, manly, religious feeling, and with good intellectual cultivation, might exercise over the sick poor, would be considerably greater and more lasting than that wrought by Sisters of the same order. At present, however, the experiment has not been tried. Perhaps the time as yet is hardly ripe for it. It may, nevertheless, be worth while thus to direct attention to the subject.

The last question which I have to consider is, whether all this which I have been advocating as a means of reforming our present nursing arrangements, is practicable.

As our workhouses in their present condition are the objects of one's chiefest anxiety, it is natural to hope that something may be done for them first. I should almost have despaired of any thing being done for their improvement by the means already pointed out, were it not for the fact, to which I have before alluded, that, in the case of the Manchester Workhouse, owing to the sound advice given to the Guardians by their medical officer, the entire nursing of the Infirmary, numbering about 500 beds, has lately been placed under the charge of the Superior of the All Saints' Home. So admirably have the Sisters and nurses fulfilled their mission there, at a time of great anxiety, owing to an epidemic of typhus fever which raged horribly when they entered on their holy work, that already they have received the unanimous thanks of the Board of Guardians, and, what is more, the approval and sanction of the Poor Law Board. This is a step in the right

direction. And the Manchester Guardians may be congratulated by every well-wisher of the poor, on the courage which they have shown in daring the opposition of the World against the Church, which they are sure to meet with, and for the large-hearted and liberal manner in which they have received and acted upon the suggestions of the Superior for the better nursing of the inmates. This, I may add, is at present the only instance in England where this system of nursing has been adopted in a workhouse.

In the case of hospitals, I have already mentioned two instances where this plan has been in operation for some time; viz., at King's College and University College Hospitals. The Great Northern Hospital is also nursed by the order of Deaconesses lately established in London; and there are, I know, several other hospitals in London and in the country where the governors are most anxious that the plan should be introduced; but there is the want of flesh and blood to carry it out. Surely there are women in England who will not longer allow this want to remain unsatisfied, when they might come forward and engage in so truly noble a work. As a rule, it may be stated that good nursing requires an average of at least one nurse to every six patients; and there should be one Sister to three nurses, so that for the nursing of our 27,500 patients who occupy the beds of our hospitals, there are required not less than 4500 trained nurses, besides at least 1000 sisters. Probably a staff as large is required for the sick inmates of our workhouses; of course some of the material now used might by proper training be utilized for this purpose.

On the Continent, as is well known, the members of the various religious orders may be counted by thousands; and it is the rule, and not the exception, for the hospitals to be nursed by them. In France, the expenses of the hospitals are defrayed from the public purse, and the management is also under State control; but the entire nursing is entrusted to the religious orders, who, with the paid officials under them as a sort of inferior nurse, are the counterpart of the only two religious orders who at present monopolize our hospital nursing.

Can we allow it any longer to be said of us, that the women of this country have less of practical benevolence, less of devotion to the Church, less of zeal for CHRIST, less of love for His poor, than the women of other countries? It must be so, unless we bestir ourselves to remedy the present abuses in our systems of public nursing. What they are may herein be seen. What they ought to be, and shall be, let our noble-hearted women answer.

ALFRED MEADOWS.

Clerical Celibacy.

"I suppose that this is good for the present distress."—1 Cor. vii. 26.

The subject which I have obtained permission to discuss in this Essay is one upon which but little has been written in our own day by members of the Anglican Communion. The course which the Church revival of the last twenty or thirty years has taken, has had more reference to the defence of Christian doctrine and to the restoration of Catholic worship, than to the condition of life and the personal requirements of the priests by whom such doctrine is preached, and through whom such worship is offered. And it was only natural that this should be the case. Considering the condition of the English Church when the *Tracts for the Times* first roused the intelligent portion of our countrymen from the state of complacent religious apathy into which they were fallen, the line taken by Church reformers could scarcely have been other than it was. Crucial doctrines long forgotten must needs be vindicated at the outset of their undertaking, as the basis upon which alone a solid and lasting superstructure could be raised. Catholic worship would follow, as a matter of course, as the natural medium through which to exhibit such doctrines to the people at large, and by which to demonstrate the application of these doctrines to God's glory and the edification of souls. Moreover, with regard to this latter development, there has been a desire, which must be allowed to be excusable, and something more, on the part of those who have been engaged in so arduous a work as that of the Catholic revival, to apply their energies to that portion of the work whose results would be most likely to attract public attention, create most interest, and exercise most direct influence both upon Churchmen and the world.

These, however, are days of vigorous progress, and the time has now arrived for considering whether a move might not with advantage be made in another direction—whether as our clergy now are, for the most part, as regards their domestic relations, the highest condition of efficiency has been reached; and, if not, whether, by the adoption of some expedient, the reported falling off in the numbers of those who present themselves for Holy Orders may not be made up by increasing the efficiency of those who are already

ordained, or who shall be so hereafter. Something has certainly been done of late years in this direction. The Theological Colleges, though by no means so satisfactory in their organization or working as they might be, have yet proved of some value in supplying to a certain extent that distinctive training for the Church's future ministers, the neglect of which is one of the gravest faults of our present University system. An important movement, yet in its infancy, has had in view the deepening of the spiritual life among the clergy, by means of periodical Clerical "Retreats." But as yet no attempt has been made to increase the working power of individual parish priests by the very obvious expedient of encouraging those of them who are able to do so, to devote themselves to a celibate life. It is the hope of convincing some at least amongst the readers of the present volume of what I hold to be the importance of this subject, and of evoking an interest which has as yet been but very partially called forth, that has given rise to the present Essay.

Of all the human race, English people are probably the most essentially and thoroughly domestic; and any proposition which clashes with this peculiarity in our social system is likely to be received at first with but a very moderate degree of favour. In addition to this, it unfortunately happens that the practice which I am about to advocate, is one which has become almost inseparably connected in men's minds with the priesthood of the Church of Rome. Now, if there is one thing which rouses the antagonism of the ordinary English mind more than an apparent interference with "the sacredness of domestic life," it is any thing which savours of an imitation of Popery; and as it so chances that the subject of which I am about to treat appears, at first sight, to offend in each of these respects, it may perhaps be thought that my selection of it has been by no means a happy one.

However, on the part of the more intelligent and candid amongst us, there is a feeling that no one should be condemned unheard; and it is this, and this alone, which encourages me to proceed. It is also possible that such a subject as this of Clerical Celibacy, its advantages and disadvantages, the restrictions by which it should be governed, with the arguments *pro* and *con*, has not been one which has engrossed any very large amount of the reader's time or thought; and that there may be considerations which deserve the attention of one who would form an impartial judgment, and arrive at a fair and unprejudiced conclusion upon the point at issue.

In order that I may not be misunderstood, a few words upon each of the two heads touched upon above becomes not only desirable, but necessary. In advocating the adoption of the

celibate life in certain cases—not so much because it is a higher one, though S. Paul teaches us to believe this to be the case, as that it is a state in which a clergyman is in many respects more free to devote himself to the duties which he has to perform—I would not speak otherwise of the "honourable estate of matrimony" than it is spoken of by S. Paul. If, with regard to both celibacy and marriage, I neither go beyond nor fall short of the teaching of one who has written so fully of both conditions, I may fairly expect to be held free from blame. With regard to the charge which may be brought against this Essay, of proposing that we should imitate, in some sort, the example of the Roman clergy, it is one to which I am but little careful to reply. The question must stand entirely upon its own merits. Granted that celibacy is adopted by the clergy of the Roman Church, we must remember that precisely the same objection was made thirty years ago to the opening of our churches for daily service; but no one would be found now-a-days foolish enough to reiterate so palpable an absurdity. In neither case does an alteration of existing practice involve any doctrinal question; and this is in itself a sufficient answer to any objections which may be raised on this score. Moreover, I must beg the reader clearly to understand, that it is the encouragement of *voluntary* celibacy on the part of the clergy for which I plead. The study of Church History forbids me to believe, that a law on such a matter made compulsory upon so large a body of men as the clergy are at the present day, would be likely to be attended with satisfactory results.

Before discussing the question of Clerical Celibacy with reference to the requirements of the Church in our own times, it would seem desirable to look back into the history of the past, and inquire, what was the general tone of feeling amongst Catholics in former ages upon this point, and what were the authoritative decrees which the Church laid down, as the rule for the clergy at various periods.

We naturally turn first to Holy Scripture, as that to which all would appeal in support of their religious opinions, and as a witness to the soundness or unsoundness of Church laws.

The high estimation in which the virginal, as distinguished from the married life, was held in primitive times, no doubt had its origin in the teaching of our LORD. That He chose a Virgin for His Mother, and that He Himself lived and died a Virgin, can scarcely be considered to be without significance. But in setting forth the Scriptural argument upon such a point as this, I may not unreasonably be suspected of laying undue stress upon certain isolated passages which apparently favour my own

views, or of deducing from such passages conclusions which they will not fairly bear. I prefer, therefore, following a writer so generally accepted as an authority, and consequently so little open to suspicion, as the present Bishop of Ely. In his treatise on the Thirty-nine Articles, Bishop Harold Browne says:—

"Both our Blessed Lord and S. Paul unquestionably give the preference to the unmarried life, as being a more favourable state for religious self-devotion than the state of matrimony. Our LORD's words are—'He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.' To some it is a gift of GOD, and those who have the gift are advised to abstain from marriage 'for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake' (S. Matt. xix. 12). I assume this to be the sense of the passage; first, because the whole stream of Christian antiquity so explained it; secondly, because I know no commentator of any credit in modern times, of whatever Church or sect, who has explained it differently. S. Paul's language illustrates our LORD's. He begins by saying that it is a good thing for a man not to marry (1 Cor. vii. 1). Still, as a general rule, he recommends marriage (vv. 2—5). He recommends it, however, as a matter of permission, not as giving a command (*κατὰ συγγνώμην, οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν*—ver. 6); for he would prefer to see all men as he was himself; 'but every man hath his proper gift, one after this manner, and another after that' (ver. 7). To the unmarried he says, it is good for them if they abide as he abode (ver. 8). Celibacy is, indeed, particularly to be advised 'for the present distress' (ver. 26)[1]. And as a general rule he lays it down that there is a benefit in an unmarried condition, because it is less subject to the cares of this life, and causes less solicitude and anxiety, giving more time for religion and devotion to GOD. These are his words:—

"'I would have you without carefulness. He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the LORD, how he may please the LORD: but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife. There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the LORD, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband. And this I speak for your own profit; not that I may cast a snare upon you, but for that which is comely, and that ye may attend upon the LORD without distraction.'—vv. 32—35.

"Here, then, though the Apostle is far from finding fault with marriage, he evidently prefers celibacy, not because there is an

[1] The Bishop appends the following footnote:—"It may be a question whether 'the present distress' means the state of persecution to which the early Christians were exposed, or the distress and anxiety of the present life." Elsewhere in the volume (p. 342, note 3), however, he cites S. Jerome (in 1 Cor. vii.) in support of the latter interpretation.

evil in marriage, but because there is less distraction in an unmarried life. Such a life undertaken and adhered to, from religious motives, involves a stricter renunciation of the world, a greater abstinence from earthly comforts and enjoyments, a more entire devotion of the soul to the one end of serving GOD." (*Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, 4th Edit., pp. 756—7.)

This extract appears peculiarly valuable, as expressing the convictions of one who is little likely to have any very strong prejudices in favour of celibacy. The Bishop of Ely very properly says—as every one who takes the words of our LORD and His Apostle in their natural sense must say—that the virginal is the higher life, notwithstanding that such interpretation runs counter to the popular feelings of the day. Indeed, he candidly confesses that at the present time "the tone of popular opinion concerning marriage and celibacy is low and unscriptural. With us, marriage is ever esteemed the more honourable state; celibacy is looked on as at least inferior, if not contemptible. 'But the base things of the world, and things that are despised, hath GOD chosen' (1 Cor. i. 28)."

The argument which the Bishop of Ely has so well drawn out from these passages of Holy Scripture, in favour of an unmarried life, is undoubtedly a very strong one; and if it applies to celibacy in general, much more would it seem applicable to that of the clergy, who would naturally be expected to choose the more excellent way. We must not, however, lose sight of other passages which equally bear upon the question, and which are commonly adduced in support of a principle directly opposed to that for which I am pleading in the present Essay. Thus, for example, S. Paul appears in some sort to contradict, or at all events seriously to lessen the force of what he had previously said—"I would that all men were even as I myself"—when in his Epistles to S. Timothy and S. Titus, he directs that bishops and deacons should respectively be the "husbands of one wife" (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6).

There is some doubt as to what the Apostle meant by the words *μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ*; but the most reasonable interpretation, and that which is supported by the greatest weight of authority, is that those who had been *twice married* were *ipso facto* disqualified for the clerical office. Hence arose the opinion, which seems to have been universal, that no "digamist" could properly be admitted to any of the higher orders in the Church. Thus Origen says that no digamist could be either bishop, priest, deacon, or church widow[2]. And Tertullian, before his lapse into

[2] Hom. 17 in Luc.

Montanism, speaks as though there could be but one opinion as to the meaning of the passage: "The discipline of the Church, and the rule of the Apostle, does not suffer the twice married to preside [3]." But it is unnecessary to adduce further testimony upon this point. It seems unquestionable that S. Paul held that a cleric *might* be married without prejudice to his character and office, if he were constitutionally unable to live as a celibate. However much the Apostle preferred a life of continency in those who embrace it, he would not lay down any law which might prove a snare to the weaker brethren, for "it is better to marry than to burn [4]."

The position, then, which I assume is this—that Clerical Celibacy, as a matter of necessity, does not rest upon any Divine law; and that in cases where it has been made obligatory, it has been so made solely upon the authority of the Church. It is important to observe that in saying this, I am but echoing the sentiments of S. Thomas Aquinas [5] and of the Council of Trent [6]. Even Liguori [7] allows that the celibacy of the clergy does not rest upon any Divine enactment, but is merely a Church law.

As to the practice of the Apostles themselves in the matter of marriage, we know but little. S. Peter is the only one who is stated in Holy Scripture to have had a wife (S. Matt. viii. 14) [8]; but it has been doubted whether he lived with her after his call to the Apostleship; and the same may be said of such other members of the Apostolic College as were married men. Except

[3] Tertull. ad. Uxor. Bk. I. 7. On the general question of Digamy as regarded in the early Church, see Tert., Lib. of Fathers, p. 419, Note N.

[4] Heb. xiii. 4. "Marriage is honourable in all," &c., is a passage often cited as an unanswerable argument against celibacy, whether clerical or lay. An examination of the Greek will show that we have here, in our English version, a very palpable instance of mistranslation; and considering how useful a text it makes against Roman Catholics when thus rendered, it requires a very large measure of charity not to attribute the error to design. The Apostle is laying down a series of moral maxims, the word μενέτω (ver. 1) giving the key as to the imperative form which the rendering of the whole should take: "Let brotherly love continue;" "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers," &c.; "Remember them that are in bonds," &c.; "Let marriage be honourable in all," &c.; "Let your conversation be without covetousness," &c., and so on. The obvious meaning of the Apostle is, "Let marriage be used honourably, and the bed be undefiled," *i. e.*, Let there be no impurity between a man and his wife; let them use marriage as not abusing it (see 1 Thess. iv. 4; 1 S. Pet. iii. 7). The passage, therefore, has not the slightest bearing upon the question of celibacy, but simply gives a rule for those who are married.

[5] Summa Theol., Sec. sec. Quæst. lxxxviii. Art. 11. [6] Sess. xxiv., Can. 9.

[7] Theol. Mor., Lib. vi. Tract. 5, § 807.

[8] Tertull. de Monog. 8, "Petrum solum maritum invenio per socrum."

upon this supposition, it is unquestionably difficult to understand the meaning of our LORD's answer to S. Peter, when he said (S. Matt. xix. 27—29)—"Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed Thee:" "JESUS said unto them, Verily I say you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the SON of MAN shall sit on the throne of His Glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

It is as though He had said—Ye who have left all and followed Me, shall have such and such a reward; and all those who, *like you*, have left all, *i.e.* houses . . . or *wife*, shall also be rewarded. A modern French writer upon the subject of Celibacy, M. l'Abbé Paul Fortini[9], cites a passage from S. Jerome to the effect that those of the Apostles who were married, ceased to live with their wives after their call: but to my knowledge I have never met with the passage, and I have been unable to discover the quotation in the original, in consequence, doubtless, of some error in the Abbé's footnote. However, unless this step had been really taken by the Apostles, it is difficult to know from whence was derived the very widely spread feeling in the early Church, that admission to the higher grades of the ministry rendered it desirable, that those who had been previously married should live thenceforth a life of continence[1]. The exaggeration of this principle, and the confusion of the Counsels of Perfection with moral duties, found expression in the heresy of the Cathari, who renounced marriage as a state of life unfitted for Christians, and whose principles were condemned by the Apostolic Canons[2].

The date and authenticity of these Canons has been a matter of some dispute among the learned; but they are generally believed to have been delivered to the Church by S. Clement of Rome, and thus to rank amongst the earliest Christian records. We gather from them the following evidence in the matter before us, as to the feeling and practice of the primitive Church.

The 6th Canon forbids any bishop, priest, or deacon to put away his wife on the plea of religion, under penalty of excom-

[9] The Abbé's pamphlet is entitled, "Ne faut-il pas que le Prêtre se marie?" p. 14.

[1] See Council of Carthage, Can. 2.

[2] Can. Apost. 51. In which a distinction is drawn between those who abstain from marriage for the sake of pious discipline, and those who do so from disgust.

munication; the 17th excludes those who have been twice married from admission to the ministry; the 18th decrees a similar exclusion in the case of those who have married widows or women who have been previously divorced; and the 26th provides that, of those who have been ordained as unmarried men, only readers and singers shall be permitted to marry after ordination. The question of living in continence with a wife is not touched upon.

Direct information upon the subject of Clerical Celibacy during the earliest centuries is but scanty, and it is chiefly incidentally that we gather that which we know about it. Dr. Newman, in his notes to Fleury, suggests that "earnestness and persecution seem at first to have superseded the need of canons, and that all but readers and singers preserved continence." (Vol. I., p. 182.) No sooner, however, did persecution cease, and the Church was in danger of suffering a reaction, than Councils assembled and Canons were passed with reference to the clergy. Thus the 33rd Canon of the Council of Eliberis, or Elvira, in Spain (cir. A.D. 309), enacted that bishops, priests, and deacons should live with their wives as though unmarried. Other Canons, passed soon after this, were somewhat less strict in their decrees. For example, in A.D. 314 the Council of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus was content to enact in its first Canon, that priests who married after ordination should be degraded; while the tenth Canon of the Council of Ancyra, held in the same year, laid down the rule that persons who at the time of ordination as deacons signified their intention of marrying might be allowed to do so; but if they married after ordination, without having previously reserved to themselves this right, they were to be deposed.

About this time, or a little later, we find evidence of a very strong feeling on the part of the laity against a married Priesthood. Through the teaching and influence of Eustathius, at one time Bishop of Sebaste, this prejudice was carried to such a height that persons refused to communicate with married priests. To counteract this notion, the Council of Gangra was held in the early part of this century, as is generally supposed, and in its fourth Canon condemned those who separated themselves from the married clergy, and who refused to receive the Holy Communion from any priest who was not living a life of continency.

It is, however, to the history of the Œcumenical Council of Nice that we must chiefly look for evidence as to the course which the Church at that day thought it right to adopt with respect to Clerical Celibacy. It would appear, that the toleration which the Christians had enjoyed under the reign of Constantine had encouraged many to seek for ordination, who were but little disposed

to frame their lives upon the rigid system which prevailed during the days of persecution. The bishops assembled at Nicæa—fearing that laxity might creep in, to the prejudice of religion—proposed that a distinct law should be passed, to the effect that bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons should hold no conjugal intercourse with the wives whom they had married prior to their ordination. Upon this Paphnutius, himself a celibate, stood up, and entreated the Synod not to frame so rigid a law. It would be sufficient, he thought, that such persons as were not married before their ordination should remain unmarried after it, "according to the ancient tradition of the Church;" but that no one should be separated from her to whom, while yet unordained, he had been legally united. The Synod assented to the advice of Paphnutius, and further debate upon the matter was suspended, "those who were already husbands being left to exercise their own discretion with reference to their wives[3]."

We must not pass over the Council of Nice without noticing its third Canon, as one to which we find no infrequent reference in subsequent periods of Church history. It was to the effect that no bishops, priests, or deacons should have women in their houses, except their mothers, sisters, aunts, or such women as should be beyond the reach of slander. The women here tacitly alluded to were called συνείσακτοι, or, *mulieres subintroductæ*. This Canon was probably occasioned by the unjustifiable act of Leontius (described by S. Athanasius in his "Apology for Flight"), which, in accordance with the provisions of the Twenty-third Apostolical Canon, resulted in his deposition from his office. The Fourth Epistle of S. Cyprian was directed against one especial feature of the practice pointed to by the Nicene Council, and is the earliest distinct reference to it. But I shall have to refer to this subject again[4].

Notwithstanding the severe decrees of the Council of Elvira in the early part of the fourth century, towards the latter portion of it there were ecclesiastics in Spain who lived with their wives, and pleaded the example of the priests of the Mosaic Law in their defence. In consequence of this, we find S. Siricius, Bishop of Rome, addressing, in A.D. 385, a decretal epistle ("the first

[3] Socr., Eccl. Hist. I. ii. Sozom., Eccl. Hist. I. 23.

[4] Mosheim (Eccl. Hist., Cent. III. Pt. ii. c. 2, § 6.) very characteristically suggests that by having women in their houses the clergy were able to maintain an unmarried life with the least violence to their inclinations. Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, considers that the Canons forbidding the practice in the case of the clergy, do not presuppose anything disgraceful, but are precautionary.—S. Cypr., Ep. IV. Lib. of the Fathers, p. 7, note k.

authentic decretal," as Dean Milman observes) to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, imposing upon the clergy the stringent law which had been overruled when proposed at the Council of Nice. "Amongst the ancients (he writes) it was customary for priests to marry, because the ministers of the Altar were obliged to have a succession of the same family; but that even they lived separate from their wives during the time of their ministration. But since CHRIST came to perfect the Law, priests and deacons are bound by an inviolable decree to observe from the day of their ordination sobriety and continence, that they may be well pleasing to GOD in the sacrifices which they *daily* offer up to Him. Such priests, then, as have sinned through ignorance, and acknowledge their fault, shall continue in the order in which they are, on condition that they live in continence for the time to come; they who persist in their fault shall be deprived of all ecclesiastical functions." (Fleury, xviii. § 35.)

Five years after the issue of this decree we have the Council of Carthage, in its second Canon, enjoining continence upon the three higher orders of the clergy, and basing their judgment upon the Apostolic rule; "That which the Apostles have taught, and antiquity itself hath preserved, let us too keep." And fifteen years later (A.D. 404) we find S. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, applying to S. Innocent about certain questions of discipline; and, amongst others, that of Clerical Celibacy came in. The Pope answered him in a decretal letter, referring to the previous decretal of S. Siricius, and determined that priests and deacons who had in ignorance lived with their wives, should henceforth preserve continence, and be incapable of promotion. If they had offended wilfully, they were to be deposed.

As exceptions are generally considered as among the best proofs of a rule, it may be worth while to mention here the name of Vigilantius, a man who may be looked upon as the patriarch of Protestantism, and who has, I believe, been so claimed by certain modern admirers. In common with some others of later date, who have become notorious from their developments in a similar direction, he began life as a tavern-keeper; but his energies seem to have been chiefly devoted to assailing the use of "lights in broad daylight," prayer for the dead, the selling of our goods to be distributed amongst the poor, monasticism (as rendering man useless), fasting, and continence. S. Jerome, who can rarely be accused of allowing any overstrained notions of politeness to interfere with the pungency of his remarks when addressing those who had the misfortune to differ from him, attacked Vigilantius in a strain more forcible than flattering.

He charged him with practising the same tricks upon Holy Scripture which he had formerly practised upon the wine that he sold, and upon the money that he had given in change; and added further that he opposed fasting, continence, and sobriety, because they interfered with the profits of his trade. As might be supposed, the opinions of Vigilantius, though they created some little sensation at the time, had no very widely-spread or lasting influence. There were, however, bishops to be found who followed in his wake, especially in the matter of continence, and who would only admit married persons into deacons' orders. Fleury thinks that this occasioned the correspondence of the bishops of Spain with Pope Siricius, and of the bishops of Gaul with Pope Innocent.

From this time we find continual reference to the Celibacy of the Clergy amongst the Canons of local Synods, more especially in the West. No definite law, indeed, had been laid down upon the subject by an Œcumenical Council; but the fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), appears, in the fourteenth Canon of its fifteenth Session, to take it for granted that the higher orders of the clergy would necessarily be celibate; for it forbids the lower orders only, who were permitted to marry, to unite themselves to Jewish, Pagan, or heretical women, except they should promise to become Christian. It would seem, however, that in the matter of marriage, a greater latitude was permitted in the Eastern than in the Western Church. The historian Socrates, writing in the early part of the fifth century, says, speaking from his own personal knowledge, that in Thessaly clerics cohabiting with their wives, even though married before ordination, were degraded. And he adds that in the East all the clergy, even the bishops, abstain from their wives; but this they do of their own accord, there being no law in force to make it necessary: for there have been among them many bishops, who have had children by their lawful wives during their episcopate[5].

As might have been expected, the enforcement of celibacy amongst so large a body of men as the Western clergy had by this time become, met with much open resistance, and not a little secret disobedience. Canon Robertson justly draws attention to the fact, that in proportion as celibacy was made obligatory upon the clergy, it became the more necessary to enact Canons prohibiting them from entertaining concubines, and other "extraneous" female companions[6].

It is evident that at this period, notwithstanding the Canons

[5] Socr., V. 23. [6] Eccl. Hist., Bk. II. c. 14.

that were passed by various Synods, and the definite prohibitions of Papal decretals, much laxity of practice prevailed throughout the West. To take an illustration from our own country, it appears from the following question put by S. Augustine to S. Gregory the Great[7], that amongst the British clergy at the period of his mission, the rule of the Anglo-Saxon Church with regard to continence (which coincided with that of other parts of Western Christendom) was but imperfectly observed: "An clerici, non continere valentes, possint contrahere; et, si contraxerint, an debeant ad sæculum redire?" Oddly enough, the Pope did not reply to the question, but simply directed that marriage was to be allowed to clerks not in Holy Orders, *i.e.*, to those who were below the rank of subdeacon[8].

I am indebted to Canon Robertson for the following paragraph, in which he supplies some important information bearing upon this subject, and that in a more condensed form than I could myself hope to compass. He tells us that "the marriage of the clergy was now the subject not only of Canons, but of imperial laws. Honorius, in A.D. 420—perhaps at the suggestion of Boniface, Bishop of Rome—enacted, in accordance with the Nicene Canon, that the clergy should not have as inmates of their houses any women except their own nearest relatives; but it was allowed that such of the clergy as had married before ordination should retain their wives; 'for,' it was said, 'those are not unfitly joined to clerks who have, by their conversation, made their husbands worthy of the priesthood.' A century later, Justinian, by several enactments, forbade the promotion of persons who had children or grandchildren to bishopries, on the ground that such connexions were a temptation to prefer the interests of kindred to those of the Church. He confirmed all the ecclesiastical prohibitions of clerical marriages, and declared the issue of such marriages illegitimate, and incapable of inheriting property[9]."

[7] Mr. Massingberd, in his "History of the Reformation," (p. 79, 2nd edit.), notes that "Gregory I., A.D. 590, . . . was the grandson or great-grandson of another Pope, Felix III., whose father Felix was also a presbyter; and these facts are twice mentioned by Gregory himself in his work, still extant." Hom. 38 in Evang., § 15.; Dial., IV. 16. See Sandini Vit. Pont., pp. 130, 590. There were married priests in Spain so late as the fourteenth century. A Council at Palencia, in Leon, A.D. 1388, regulates their garb and tonsure.—L'Enfant, Conc. Pis., Pref. xxvii.

[8] Robertson's Eccl. Hist., Vol. II. Bk. i. c. 9.

[9] Eccl. Hist., Vol. I. Bk. ii. c. 14. Waddington, when remarking in his "Church History" (chap. xiii. p. 211), that at the end of the fifth century the rule of celibacy was very commonly observed by the clergy of Rome, adds

It is important at this point of our inquiry to mention the decrees of the famous Quini-sext Council (A.D. 690), as that which has governed the practice of the Eastern Church from that day to our own as regards the marriage of the clergy. The authority of this Council, as is well known, is not acknowledged by the Western Church, its decrees not having been formally signed by the Bishop of Rome, who dissented from certain of its provisions. Amongst its enactments, it forbade all those of the clergy who had attained the rank of subdeacons to marry after their ordination; but at the same time, it allowed those who had been previously united to live with their wives. Bishops, however, were excluded from this indulgence; and the wives of all bishops, who might then happen to be married, were required to separate from their husbands, and to betake themselves to the religious life[1].

Without prejudice to the argument, I may pass rapidly over the next two or three hundred years, during which it is evident, that the irregularities of the clergy with regard to this question of marriage increased rather than diminished. In support of this, it will be sufficient to cite the decrees of two Councils held in the course of the ninth century. In that of Aix (A.D. 836) we find a complaint that priests kept women in their houses, causing scandal thereby; while that of Mayence, in A.D. 888, wholly forbade the clergy to have any women at all living with them, that occasion of evil reports and wicked deeds might be entirely removed. For although there were Canons extant allowing certain women (mothers and sisters) to reside in the houses of clerics, yet "Sæpe audivimus, per illam concessionem plurima scelera esse commissa, ita ut quidam sacerdotum cum propriis sororibus concumbentes, filios ex eis generassent." As regards the period which followed, Du Pin acknowledges that "although there have been irregularities in all ages, yet that it cannot be said with any show of truth that they were equal to those of the tenth century, or that they were ever so universal;" and when we come to examine into the matter with respect to the question of Clerical Celibacy, the revelations are certainly somewhat startling. With the clergy

in a note, that "a distinction in this respect was observed a century earlier between the Catholic and the Arian clergy; the *laxity* (*sic*) of the latter, who were almost invariably married, was made a matter of reproach by their more rigid adversaries." Considering the strong Protestant bias of this author, the note is of some value.

[1] By the rule of the Russian Church, "A Parish Priest *must* be married, and in the event of losing his wife, either retires from the secular to the religious clergy, or, if he marries again, he lays aside every sacerdotal function." —Neale's "Essays on Liturgiology," p. 260.

concubinage frequently took the place of marriage; and, from the sixth Canon of the Council of Poitiers (A.D. 1000)—"Nullus Presbyter neque diaconus fœminam in sui domo teneat, *neque in cellario, neque in secreto loco*"—it appears that they were sometimes driven to resort to strange expedients. Living, however, as the clergy of that day did, under so rigid a law, some considerable allowance must be made for them. It would be most unjust for us, who are free to marry or not as we please, to "write down judgments with a pen hard-nibbed" against those whose lot was cast under a different *régime*. In most cases, we may believe, the clerics of a former age, who were subject to the Roman obedience, as the modern phrase runs, would be faithful to the women whom they had chosen as their partners, though their union was neither sanctioned nor blessed by the Church. Thus even when not married—a necessary proviso as regards the clergy of some countries—such clerks would not unreasonably look upon their partners in a very different light from that in which they would be regarded in these days amongst ourselves.

And similarly as to the position which these unwedded wives of the clergy occupied in the estimation of the world, it is probable that their condition was held to be not irreconcilable with respectability, even at a time when the general tone of morality was higher than it was during the century of which I have been treating. At least this seems to be the conclusion which ought to be drawn from Chaucer's well-known description of the Miller of Trumpington's wife:—

"His name was hightc deynous Symekyn.
A wyf he hadde, come of noble kyn;
The persoun of the toun hir fadir was.
With hir he gaf ful many a pan of bras,
For that Symkyn schuld in his blood allye.
Sche was i-fostryd in a nonnerye;
For Symkyn wold no wyf, as he sayde,
But sche were wel i-norissched and a mayde,
To saven his estaat and yomanrye,
And sche was proud and pert as is a pye.
* * * *
Hir thoughte ladyes oughten hir to spare,
What for hir kynreed, and hir nortelrye,
That sche had lerned in the nonnerye.
* * * *
The persoun of the toun, for sche was feir,
In purpos was to maken hir his heir,

Bothe of his catel and his mesuage,
And straunge made it of hir mariage.
His purpos was to bystow hir hye
Into som worthy blood of ancetrye.
For holy chirche good moot be dispendid
On holy chirche blood that is descendid.
Therfore he wolde his joly bloode honoure,
Though that he schulde holy chirche devoure."

The Reeve's Tale.

Mr. Robert Bell does indeed suggest that the "parson" in question might have been married before he took orders—a perfectly gratuitous supposition; "otherwise," adds Mr. Bell, "the circumstance of his daughter's birth could hardly be a subject of pride to her husband." But this is begging the whole question. We know that even in these days, concubinage is looked upon by the vulgar with great tolerance, in the rare cases where it is believed that the persons would marry if they were not prevented by some artificial restrictions from doing so; and it is probable that that feeling would be infinitely stronger in favour of a whole class whose celibacy had been relaxed by long though irregular prescription. It may, therefore, be safely concluded that the children of a secular priest enjoyed a precedence amongst his parishioners not much inferior to that accorded to a clergyman's family at the present day; and, if so, the paternity of such children, though it might occasionally be made a subject of reproach, did not, as a rule, involve any great social stigma.

This digression seems to have been necessary to assist the reader in judging impartially of the condition of affairs as regards the question of Clerical Celibacy in its social aspect during the Middle Ages. We will now return to our historical examination.

It appears that towards the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, some of the ruling powers, and these none of the most wise or temperate, in despair of enforcing the law of celibacy as absolute, were compelled to shut their eyes to the cases of clerical marriages and of concubinage by which they were surrounded. Robertson, to whom I have before referred as perhaps one of the most impartial of modern Church historians, and one to whose volumes any reader may have access, speaking of Ratherius of Verona, says, that although he was "throughout a vehement opponent of the marriage of the clergy, yet he seems at last to have been convinced that the attempt was hopeless, and contented himself with endeavouring to preserve

the hierarchy from becoming hereditary, by desiring that the married priests should choose laymen as husbands for their daughters, and should not allow their sons to be clerks[2]." A few years later, we find Benedict VIII., at the Council of Pavia (A.D. 1012), inveighing against the practice which had crept in, of benefices becoming hereditary, and decreeing that the sons of clerics, whether born of wives or concubines, though in mercy they might be allowed to fill the lowest offices in the ministry, should never be promoted to the higher orders.

When S. Gregory VII. was raised to the Papal Chair, he found the Western Church in an exceedingly disorganized condition, and at once set to work to carry out a reform. In his first Synod, held A.D. 1074, some most stringent decrees were passed respecting Clerical Celibacy, in the hope of counteracting the irregularities which were rife. These enactments were, however, received by the clergy of Italy, Germany, and France with more than dissatisfaction. Strong remonstrances were sent in against such rigorous laws as those which were attempted to be enforced. The Milanese clergy boldly maintained the lawfulness of clerical marriages under certain restrictions, and quoted their former Archbishop, S. Ambrose, as their authority. Those who opposed the principle of such marriages, they stigmatized as "Paterini," a term of reproach commonly applied to the Manichæans[3]. A Council held at Paris, A.D. 1074, declared the Pope's decrees intolerable and irrational. The Germans went so far as to say, that to interdict the marriage of the clergy, was the act of a heretic. And even Matthew Paris, though a monk, and therefore naturally the more inclined to take a rigorous view of the question, severely censured the Pope's conduct, and declared that never had even heresy produced a greater schism; that it proved the occasion of great insobriety and licence, and that the vow of chastity was frequently broken. England, however, seems to have been a little more favourable to S. Gregory's measures than was the case with some of the Continental countries; for, in A.D. 1076, the Council of Winchester, under Archbishop Lanfranc, passed some decrees in support of the Pope's system of reform, though less stringent in their provisions than those of the Synod which had been held two years previously at Rome. It simply enacted that whilst canons must be unmarried, the country clergy who lived with their wives should not be required to leave them; but at

[2] Eccl. Hist., Vol. II. Bk. ii. c. 8.

[3] I believe that a part of the city of Milan is still known as the "Contrada de' Pattari;" but how the name originated I cannot say.

the same time, it forbade the marriage of those who were yet unmarried, and provided that bishops should not in future ordain any but single men. This relaxation of the Papal decree was of no very long duration; for in A.D. 1102 we find a national Council, held under Archbishop Anselm, at Westminster, enacting that no cleric should be allowed to marry, and that if already married he was to separate from his wife; and further, that those who refused submission to this decree should not be privileged to say Mass; and if any such presumed to do so, the faithful were forbidden to be present at the service. It is worth remarking, that this Synod was the first one which absolutely denied the liberty of marriage to the English clergy[4].

By dint of indomitable perseverance, and, as we have seen, in the teeth of the most determined opposition, Hildebrand carried his point. Irregularities continued in England, as was natural, and that to a sufficient extent to render it necessary that Canons should be passed—as, for instance, in A.D. 1237, and again in A.D. 1268—against the retention of wives or the keeping of con-

[4] "It was no unusual thing for the bishops of the Norman-English Church to be married men before Langton's time (A.D. 1200). Sampson of Bayon, Bishop of Worcester, where he succeeded Wulfstan, A.D. 1096, was the father of Thomas, Archbishop of York, the second of that name, who was raised to the see A.D. 1109. Richard Peckett, Bishop of Coventry, A.D. 1161, was the son of Robert Peckett, a married bishop of the same see. Reginald Fitz Joceline, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1191, was the son of Joceline, Bishop of Salisbury. Geoffrey Rydal, A.D. 1174, who built a cathedral at Ely, sent this excuse to the Pope for not going to Rome to be instituted to his bishopric, that 'he had a Gospel dispensation for it—he had married a wife, and therefore he could not come.' When Pope Innocent III., who took King John's crown from him, had also, by Langton's means, caused the open profession of marriage to be prohibited, there were still bishops living with their wives. One of these was Boniface, a Savoyard, and kinsman to the queen of Henry III., who was made Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1244.

"Many of the early Popes were married men, or sons of married bishops and priests. Pope Hormisdas was not only married, but left a son, Silverius, who was also Pope some time after him. Even after the time that Pope Gregory VII. had forbidden priests' marriages, Pope Adrian IV., whose proper name was Nicholas Breakspeare, an Englishman, and the only Englishman who ever became Pope, was the son of a married priest who lived at Langley, near S. Alban's. He was raised to S. Peter's Chair, A.D. 1154. More than a hundred years later, A.D. 1265, Pope Clement IV., a married priest, who had a wife and children, after having become a widower, was made bishop, cardinal, and Pope—and no bad Pope either. He had two daughters; one of whom choosing to be a nun, he gave her thirty pounds only, that he might not do anything to help her to break her vow of poverty. The other he married to an honest gentleman of a middle rank, and gave her three hundred pounds, telling her it was all she was to expect from him."—Churton's "Early English Church," pp. 357, 358.

cubines by the clergy. But from the time of S. Gregory VII., the matter may be considered as virtually settled, and Clerical Celibacy became the law, and to a certain extent the practice throughout the Western Church.

Considering the extensive period over which our inquiry has ranged, and the important place which the question of Clerical Celibacy has occupied in the history of the Church in times past, the preceding pages must, of course, be considered as containing but the merest sketch of the subject. I trust, however, that, so far as it goes, it will not be found open to the charge of partiality or unfairness. Brief as it is, I am not acquainted with any English treatise of modern date, and within the reach of general readers, which professes to give a connected view of this question, even in as much detail as the foregoing pages afford; and hence I venture to hope that although somewhat dry reading for the many, there may yet be a few persons who will not find it otherwise than interesting and useful.

In the selection which has been made from among the vast mass of materials which necessarily come under consideration in the course of such an inquiry as this, I have endeavoured to seize upon the more salient points as landmarks, whereby to trace the progress of opinion, and to exhibit, in as brief and lucid a form as might be, the practice of the Church at different periods with regard to this matter. We are thus, to a certain extent, in a position to review the question as a whole, and, barring personal experience, to regard it almost as we may conceive our Reformers doing, and thus be the better able to arrive at a fair appreciation of the line which, through their influence, the Church of England adopted three centuries ago.

There are, one would think, few persons amongst those whose judgments are unfettered by early prejudice, who will be prepared to assert that the enforcement of celibacy upon the whole body of the clergy, without distinction, has been accompanied with satisfactory results. That there has been an element of good in the rule, is no doubt true enough[5]; and the principle that "the servant should be as his Master," upon which it is based, stands upon the very highest authority. Still, experience

[5] Guizot, in his "Hist. of Civilization," (Lect. V.) speaks of celibacy as having prevented the clerical body from becoming a caste, and thus preserved the Church from the evils incident thereupon. See also Balmez, who, in his "Protestantism Compared with Catholicity," chap. 60, treats of this at length.

no less than Holy Scripture assures us that "all men cannot receive this saying;" and the consequences of the confusion of the Counsels of Perfection with ordinary moral duties, must be regarded in the light of warning rather than of encouragement. I confess that I am utterly at a loss to reconcile with the bare hard facts of history, the expressions of some Roman Catholic writers on this subject—such, for example, as those of the late Père Lacordaire, in his twenty-second "Conference" at Nôtre Dame, when he says—"Thanks be to GOD, the Catholic priesthood has undergone that trial (celibacy) during nearly twenty centuries. Its enemies have watched it unceasingly in the present time and in history; they have signalized some partial scandals, but the entire body has remained secure."

There appears to have been some hesitation on the part of the Reformers in Henry the Eighth's reign, in moving for an alteration of the law which enjoined the celibacy of the priesthood. For a time the anti-reforming party had the ear of the King; and in A.D. 1538, they succeeded in obtaining the issue of a proclamation reprobating the marriage of priests without the "common consent of his Highness and the realm," and forbidding any to marry or to retain their wives openly under pain of deprivation. The Bishop of S. Asaph, in treating of this portion of the history of the English Church, remarks that "the document was so worded as to screen Cranmer from any danger, whose wife was at this time living secretly with him, while it held out a prospect of a change of law." The Act of the Six Articles, which passed in the following year, was certainly not very favourable to such a prospect, for it distinctly laid down that persons after admission to the priesthood may not marry by the law of GOD. The feeling throughout the country in general was very strong against this Act; whether by reason of the injunctions themselves which it contained, or because of the cruelty of the penalties by which they were enforced. With regard to compulsory celibacy, and the sentiments of a large number of the clergy respecting it, it is probable that they were not unfairly represented by the witty reply of Lawney, chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk, as related by Strype[6]. Said the Duke, "O, my Lawney (knowing him of old much to favour priests' matrimony), whether may priests now have wives or no?" "If it please your Grace," replied he, "I cannot well tell whether priests may have wives or no, but well I wot, and I am sure of it, for all your Act, that wives will have priests."

[6] Mem. of Cranmer, c. 8.

After continuing in force for nine years, the Act of the Six Articles was repealed by the first Parliament of Edward VI. The Convocation, sitting simultaneously with it, passed a resolution in favour of the marriage of the clergy, which in the Lower House was carried by 35 against 14. This did not become law until the second Parliament of Edward, when there was passed "An Act to take away all positive Laws made against the Marriage of Priests," of which the following is the preamble:—

"Although it were not only better for the estimation of priests, and other ministers in the Church of GOD, to live chaste, sole, and separate from the company of women and the bond of marriage, but also thereby might the better intend to the administration of the Gospel, and be less intricated and troubled with the charge of household, being free and unburdened from the care and cost of finding wife and children, and that it were most to be wished that they would willingly and of their selves endeavour themselves to perpetual chastity and abstinence from the use of women: Yet, forasmuch as the contrary hath rather been seen, and such uncleanness of living, and other inconveniences, not meet to be rehearsed, have followed of compelled chastity, and of such laws as have prohibited those (such persons) the godly use of marriage; It were better, and rather to be suffered in the commonwealth, that those which could not contain should, after the counsel of Scripture, live in holy marriage than feignedly abuse with worse enormity outward chastity or single life:

"Be it therefore enacted," &c.

Later on in this reign, we find an Act passed which served as a kind of corollary to the one above cited. It was entitled, "An Act for the Declaration of a Statute made for the Marriage of Priests, and of Legitimation of their Children," and by this married priests were placed in every respect upon the same footing as other subjects. On the accession of Mary, these permissive statutes were repealed; and they remained in the same condition throughout Elizabeth's reign, until the first year of King James, when the latter Acts of Edward VI. were revived and made perpetual, and priests' children made legitimate[7]. It is, however, to be observed, that although not positively repealed, the Injunctions of Elizabeth take it for granted, that the statutes of Mary with regard to this question were no longer in force. The clergy of that day do not appear to have been much more prudent in the matter of marriage than they commonly are in our own, and Elizabeth consequently decreed, that no priest or deacon should

[7] Strype's "Parker," II. 461.

marry without the approbation first obtained of the bishop and two justices of the peace for the county, nor without the consent of the woman's parents. The marriage of bishops was to be sanctioned by the metropolitan and commissioners appointed by the Queen, and that of deans and heads of houses by their visitors; and in case of neglecting these orders, they became incapable of holding ecclesiastical benefices [8]. Had this rule been now in force, at least one notorious clerical scandal might have been prevented. Elizabeth was undoubtedly opposed to the principle of clerical marriage, and would have imposed more stringent laws respecting it, had she been able to do so. As it was, she did forbid the residence of women within Cathedral closes [9].

This is all curious and interesting enough, but the question which it chiefly behoves us to resolve, is this:—What is the view which the Church of England takes of matrimony in general, and of that of the clergy in particular? The expressions used in the Prayer Book and Articles supply a very definite answer. The Marriage Service plainly acknowledges the principle that celibacy is the higher life, for marriage is spoken of as a permissive and honourable estate, ordained by GOD "as a remedy against sin and to avoid fornication, that such persons *as have not the gift of continency* might marry, and keep themselves undefiled members of CHRIST'S body." And as Dr. Pusey [10], speaking of the Act passed in Edward's reign, of which the preamble is given above, and of the feeling of those times in favour of the celibacy of the clergy which it implies, says: "Our Marriage Service goes further, and in the midst of its touching commendation of the 'honourable estate' of matrimony, implies a holy celibacy to be, for those to whom it is given, a higher state. For in that it speaks of 'continency' as a 'gift,' it must imply that it is an especial favour of GOD to those to whom it is given."

The terms in which the Thirty-second Article is couched are also to be remarked; there is certainly nothing in it which can in any way be considered as opposed to the principle of celibacy, but rather the reverse. It runs as follows:—"Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by GOD'S law either to vow the estate of single life or to abstain from marriage; therefore *it is lawful* [the Article expresses no opinion as to the expediency—it is simply lawful] also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

[8] Q. Elizabeth's "Injunctions" (A.D. 1559), § 29.
[9] Strype's "Parker," I. 212.
[10] Letter to Dr. Jelf, pp. 129, 130.

In common with certain other of the Thirty-nine Articles, the Thirty-second was directed, not against any authorized Roman statements, but against a popular error which was current at the time. This is obvious from the fact that even the most determined advocates of Clerical Celibacy[1] admit that it rests on ecclesiastical rule, and not on "GOD's law." On the other hand, as Dr. Pusey remarks, "the tone of the Article is contrary to men's modern practice. It does not take it for granted, as a matter of course, that clergymen will marry as soon as they can provide for a family, as if this were obviously the best, both for themselves and those committed to them; but it implies, as does the Marriage Service for all, that it is a matter of Christian prudence and wisdom to decide in which estate, married or single, they may best serve the LORD, and that they will decide, not with a view to earthly joy, but as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness."

There is no reasonable doubt, that the interpretation of the Thirty-second Article here given by Dr. Pusey is the true one, and that he has very fairly expressed the mind of the Church of England with regard to this matter. In the remaining portion of this paper, an attempt will be made to show that, in the case of those clergymen who can do so, "Christian prudence and wisdom" would dictate a celibate rather than a married life, as that which is best not only for themselves, but for those committed to their charge.

The question of Clerical Celibacy is one which is capable of being viewed in an eminently practical light, and, in these days, this, of itself, ought to recommend it to thoughtful persons as one with a *primâ facie* claim to consideration. I am very far from undervaluing the directly ascetic aspect, in which the subject will naturally present itself to many devout minds amongst us; but as the object of this Essay is rather to clear the ground in preparation, if it may be, for future discussion, the view which will commend itself to the largest number, whilst at the same time it is calculated to be of interest to all, would seem to be the most suitable and useful one to bring forward. Following this principle, the first idea which would occur to most people would be, the bearing of Clerical Celibacy upon the question of Finance.

It has been calculated that the average value of assistant-curacies throughout the country is considerably under 100*l.* a year, while that of incumbencies is very little, if at all, over

[1] E.g., S. Jerome adv. Jov., quoted in "Tract 90." See also S. Thos. Aq.; The Council of Trent, &c., cited above, p. 6.

200*l.* The Prospectus issued by the "Poor Clergy Relief Society," and attached to their Report for 1865, places this matter of clerical incomes in a very clear light. It runs thus:—"From well-established statistics, it appears that there are *five thousand curates* ministering in the Church in England and Wales whose incomes do not exceed 80*l.* per annum, many hundreds of whom have not even so much as 50*l.* per annum; whilst there are also no less than *five thousand beneficed clergymen* whose incomes from the Church are under 150*l.* per annum; so that it may be safely stated that *ten thousand ministers* of the Established Church have not more than 100*l.* per annum for their high and holy services, their work and labour of love as 'Ambassadors of CHRIST.'" This is, of course, miserable remuneration for men of education; but we must take facts as they are, and make the best of them.

Another point also must be borne in mind in the discussion, which is this, that the worldly prospects of a clergyman are totally different from those of a layman engaged in a secular profession or trade. In the case of the latter, talents, diligence, and attention will nearly always ensure a gradual increase of income; whilst the advancement of the former is dependent far more upon influential interest, than upon personal merit. The probability of assistant curates being able sooner or later to obtain small incumbencies is certainly considerable; but the increased pecuniary responsibilities which such incumbencies entail, renders it very doubtful whether, in a monetary point of view, the clergymen who obtain them are gainers thereby. With such an income as a cleric, under ordinary circumstances, can fairly expect to command, apart from extraneous sources, it becomes in reality not merely a question of prudence, but a question of honesty, whether he ought to enter upon the married state. It is probable that by dint of care and self-denial he will be able to live alone with a moderate degree of comfort—this is as it should be—but marriage entirely changes the aspect of affairs. We often hear it said by thoughtless people, that the income which will support one, will be enough for two. Nothing can possibly be a greater mistake, or more strikingly exhibit the blind self-deception which persons are willing to practise upon themselves, when they want an excuse for an imprudent course of action. Moreover, the supposition is, of course, in itself based upon a fallacy; the children, with the serious expenses which they entail, are entirely lost sight of. In addition to this, it must be remembered how materially marriage alters the condition of a man in the eyes of the world. So long as he is single

it matters little how inexpensively he lives; and if it be known that he remains single voluntarily, even from no higher motives than those of prudence, his self-denial will command respect. But for a married man to support such a position of respectability as a clergyman must have, if he is to maintain his influence with a certain section of his parishioners, and that a large one, an outlay is involved which few calculate upon beforehand.

It is, however, unsatisfactory to deal with this question merely in generalities; still these remarks were necessary to pave the way for a more specific examination of the case as it stands financially. Let us now inquire what is the lowest annual sum which a married clergyman will need, granting that the principles just enunciated are reasonable and sound. The following calculation has been made for one living in London, and will be found to be under rather than above the mark.

For rent, rates, and taxes, at least 50*l.* a year must be counted for a house in a respectable street, and the lowest estimate for furnishing such a house with even a moderate regard to comfort, would be about 150*l.* Food for a man, his wife, and one servant, would not amount to much less than 80*l.* a year, exclusive of beer, wine, and extras. 10*l.* would be considered but poor wages for a servant; we will, however, specify this sum for the sake of round numbers. There are few men who would be able to clothe themselves under 10*l.* a year, and fewer women, brought up in the position which a clergyman's wife may be presumed to have occupied, who would be satisfied with less than 15*l.* for a like purpose. Let us reckon 5*l.* more as a small margin, and we have 170*l.* as the sum required for bare necessaries of life; a sum, that is to say, not much short of double the average stipend of an assistant curate. In due course, children may be expected, involving additional expense in the way of servants, food, clothing, and medical attendance[2]. Supposing that there is a family (and clergymen's families have not generally the character of being smaller than those of other people), in the matter simply of food not less than a weekly average of seven shillings a head must be reckoned, counting children as well as adults. Thus for husband, wife, three children, and two servants, about 130*l.* will be required for one item alone. Then, there is the very important question

[2] The friend to whom I am indebted for these items—a London business man of moderate income—told me that the birth of his first child involved him in an expense of 100*l.* for medical attendance, nursing, &c. This, of course, must be considered as an exceptional outlay, caused by the serious illness of the mother; but it is a contingency from which no married clergyman can secure exemption.

of life insurance. No man of ordinary prudence, whose position is such that his income necessarily ceases with his life, can, with justice to his wife and family, omit to make some provision for them in the event of his decease; and no doubt the most convenient method of doing this is to insure his life. In calculating the annual expenses of a household, this consideration must needs have a place. The lowest sum for which one in a clergyman's position would insure, would probably be 500*l.*, and to secure this amount, supposing that he took out his policy at the age of 25, he would have to pay an annual premium of from 10*l.* to 12*l.*; if he did not begin until he was 30 years old, the premium would range from 12*l.* to 14*l.* 10*s.* a year. For such a family as that which I have instanced above, we may fairly take the following estimate—which is certainly as low as it can reasonably be calculated—as the expenditure for positive necessaries; supposing, that is to say, that they live as a family in the position of a clergyman's is ordinarily expected to live at the present day:—

House-rent, rates, and taxes . .	£50
Living for a family of seven persons.	130
Servants' wages	20
Clothing: husband and wife . .	25
Clothing: three children . . .	10
Life insurance	12
Total .	£247

This is wholly exclusive of what will naturally be required for medical attendance—a large item in the expenses of some families; almsgiving, which, for obvious reasons, in the case of a clergyman, cannot possibly be counted at less than a tenth of his whole income; educational expenses as the children grow up; railway and cab fares occasionally; and extras of various kinds which would by no means come under the head of extravagances. Reckon these at 53*l.* a year, which is little enough, and 300*l.* is the sum total which every clergyman, in London at any rate, must calculate upon being required to meet within a very few years after his marriage; and he must be clever to manage upon that.

It may be said, that whoever marries a clergyman ought not to expect to live a life of ease and luxury. Granted that they ought not, still there is a very wide range between luxury and such narrow pinching poverty as must necessarily ensue from clerical marriages, in cases where there is little or no private income to fall back upon when professional resources are exhausted. The artificial way in which young ladies are brought

up in the present day, renders each generation less fitted than the previous one for any thing even approaching to a life of poverty and hardship; and in the days of their courtship this is the last thing, practically considered, which enters into their minds. It is also worth notice, that whilst the wealth of the country is generally increasing, and with it expensive tastes and habits (by which young ladies are not generally supposed to be wholly uninfluenced), a corresponding increase does not take place with regard to the sources from whence clerical emoluments are chiefly derived. Hence, while their expenses are getting larger in the event of their marriage, the incomes of clergymen remain the same. If young clergymen are, as a rule, the most imprudent of all young men when marriage is concerned, I am afraid that the young ladies whom they favour with their attentions are, generally speaking, none of the most sage. No doubt parents ought to interfere when there seems little prospect of their daughter's suitor having sufficient to maintain her in moderate comfort; but experience shows, that when there are several marriageable daughters still at home, a good deal is taken for granted which strict prudence would scarcely justify. It is found in practice that a clerical lover is, generally speaking, more graciously received both by parents and daughters than a lay one. There are two reasons in particular which may be adduced to account for this, one of which more directly appeals to the feminine mind, while the other has greater weight with that of the opposite sex. In the first place, there is in itself a certain position attained by the wife of a clergyman which, in some sort, gives her a precedence over the wife of the professional layman or man of business; and those who know women best, will be best able to appreciate the influence of such a consideration. And, secondly, the fact of a husband being in Holy Orders is, to a certain extent, a guarantee that he will at any rate be free from gross vices, and implies a probability of his maintaining in the eyes of the world a character which will not compromise his wife or her connexions.

Clergymen are generally said to be the worst men of business of any class of the community, and they rarely appear in this character to greater disadvantage than in matters connected with marriage. When a man who is engaged in any secular avocation wishes to take a wife, the first question which he commonly asks himself is, whether he is able to support her; and if his income is not such as to justify his marriage, he simply puts it off until his pecuniary position has improved. And further, with a fair prospect of a gradually increasing income from his profession or trade as years go on, he is able to marry upon a smaller annual

sum than would be the case with one who has a fixed, unvarying salary, even though at the outset it be somewhat larger in amount. With a clergyman such considerations are too frequently disregarded; and the increased expenses which will necessarily be entailed by an increasing family, without any probable augmentation of income to meet such expenses, are often not taken into account. If the possibility of his not being able to meet his expenses does occur to him, I am afraid that he is sometimes disposed to comfort himself with the reflection that his own parents, not liking to have their son in difficulties, will give him some assistance, and that his wife's family will not permit her and her children to be reduced to actual want. But is this just towards the families of either husband or wife? A parent will make over to his son or daughter on the wedding day such a sum as he can afford, which is often little enough; and every five-pound note which is received afterwards, over and above his or her own fair share, is taken from the other members of the family, who, by being more provident, have maintained themselves in independence, and who consequently are more deserving. If any really unforeseen calamity occurs, the question, of course, assumes a totally different aspect; but for a cleric to reckon upon external aid as an excuse for an imprudent marriage, is surely as questionable an act of morality as for a man with only a sovereign in the world to order an expensive suit of clothes in the hope that his father will pay the bill.

Some readers will perhaps think these remarks a little too severe, and the statement with regard to the reckless way in which poor clergymen enter upon marriage overdrawn. If so, I would ask them whether they have ever taken the trouble to inquire into facts. Any one who wishes for a proof of clerical improvidence would do well to read the Report of the "Society for the Relief of Poor Clergymen," to which reference has already been made. Among the "cases" cited, in that for last year they will find the following given:—A curate, twenty-one years in Holy Orders; sole income, 100*l.* a year; a wife and six children dependent upon him. An Irish vicar, eleven years in Orders; income, 68*l.* a year; ten children. A curate, thirty years in Orders; income, 130*l.*; nine children. Irish incumbent, twenty-four years in Orders; income, 60*l.*; three children. Clergyman, twenty-nine years in Orders; income, 100*l.*; five children. Widow of a clergyman, left entirely destitute, with nine children. Another, similarly situated, with six children. Two orphan girls, left entirely destitute. And about twenty "cases" more in which the same story is repeated over and over again. Certainly a man

must have a heart of stone not to commiserate these poverty-stricken clergymen and their families, more especially as these twenty or thirty examples of what I must term clerical paupers form but a fractional part of the few, comparatively speaking, whose abject condition has compelled them to seek the aid of strangers through the medium of this Society, and are merely to be considered as typical of a class of distress which is very widely felt throughout the country. Still, such commiseration must not prevent our viewing the matter in a common-sense and business-like light. Without laying ourselves open to a charge of hard-heartedness, we may without impropriety ask what right a man has to marry without a reasonable prospect of being able to support a wife and family. If it be absolutely necessary for him to marry—a question about which he can surely make up his mind before he is three-and-twenty—let him do so by all means; but in that case we may fairly expect him to make choice of a calling which offers a probable chance of providing him with the means of living as a married man, instead of one which in all probability will bring him and his family, sooner or later, to want. If it be said, that he is induced to enter the ministry of the Church from high motives, and that he is willing to run the risk of a life of poverty which may come upon him in consequence, well and good. This, however, can only apply to himself, for he has obviously no business to entail such poverty upon a wife. Motives, if they be really high ones, will not be confined to one individual aspiration, but will be evidenced by his conduct as a whole. Hence I repeat that a clergyman, or one about to become a clergyman, supposing that he has not sufficient pecuniary prospects to justify him in incurring the expense of a family, has no right to marry. It is unjust towards his relatives, who are compromised by it; it is unjust towards the public, who are expected to relieve the want caused by reckless improvidence; it is unjust towards his wife and family, whom he drags with him into penury and distress; and, last, though not least, it is unjust towards the Church in whose service he ministers, as it casts upon her a reproach which she has no right to bear. All honour is due to those who, of their charity, take an active part in the Society which I have named; but still, I contend that it is simply untrue to say generally of the necessitous clerics for whom they plead, that they are "a class of men whose poverty is their misfortune and not their fault[3]."

[3] These remarks are in a great measure applicable to another Charity—"The Clergy Orphan Corporation," from whose offices harrowing descriptions

It is a favourite idea with young clergymen, that by marrying they multiply their working power in the parish to which they are attached. In other words, they expect that a wife will prove a kind of feminine assistant-curate, and be able to do a vast number of things to help her husband in his parish work. There is the Maternity Charity to be looked to, and the Girls' School to be superintended, and the Women and Children's Clothing Club to be arranged, and half-a-dozen other parochial institutions to be kept in good working order, which the incumbent or assistant curate feels somewhat unequal to, and which he thinks a wife could so conveniently manage in his stead. But it may reasonably be asked, why should a clergyman's wife be different from the wife of any other professional man? The doctor's wife is not expected to nurse her husband's patients, nor the wife of the lawyer to busy herself about her husband's clients (I do not refer to professional matters); why should the clergyman's wife stand upon a different footing? Why should she be expected to take part in matters which are as manifestly beyond her province as her husband's business would be, if she were married to the solicitor or the medical man? For the wives of clergymen to be regarded as married Sisters of Mercy, is a fundamental error. There are, of course, certain things which she can, and naturally will, do in the parish under her husband's direction; but it does not appear why they should be different, either in kind or in degree (to speak generally), from those which the surgeon's or attorney's wife would do under the same clerical superintendence. There are many ways in which a lady may be of infinite use to the sick and poor in her neighbourhood; but this applies to all ladies who have some leisure time, and not to the wife of the clergyman more than to the wife of any one else. Indeed, there is a reason for thinking that it applies less to her than to others; for every devout mistress of a secular household is a fresh centre of those good works which it is most undesirable should be concentrated in the Parsonage alone.

It is a primary rule in all good government, that each person should attend to his own business, and leave others to attend to theirs. This is true in small communities as in great ones; and in nothing is its soundness more necessary to be asserted than with reference to the question which we are now considering. The

of candidates for election are received half-yearly by subscribers. In all probability, the needy children to whose benefit the income of this Society is applied, are, in the majority of cases, the offspring of improvident marriages; in which case it does not appear why "the orphans of clergymen deserve special sympathy."

parochial Mrs. Proudie is the reverse of an acquisition in her husband's domain. If it be asked, how that portion of the work in a parish which requires a woman's aid is to be performed, the answer is a sufficiently simple one. The best organization would be, of course, a Parochial Sisterhood, whose members should devote themselves entirely to such portion of the work of a parish as most properly comes within a woman's province. Where this most valuable institution cannot be had, let the clergyman (not his wife) enlist the services of such ladies in his parish as he can depend upon, and arrange for each to take a separate branch of the work under his superintendence, and be responsible for its proper management. Under this system, the clergyman's wife, supposing her to be justified in undertaking it, will have her own share in common with the rest; but if she assume the functions of directress, or be in any way distinguished from the others, the chances are that her co-workers will by degrees drop off, and she will find herself left alone to manage as she can.

I repeat, then, that, except in a limited degree, parochial work is not the work of a clergyman's wife, and it ought not to be expected of her. The writer of the article entitled "The Priest in the World," in the January number of *Fraser's Magazine*, makes the following sensible remark upon this head. Speaking of a wife as a "helpmate" he says:—"It is very questionable whether a man is helped by a wife who lugs incessantly at the same oar along with himself. It is not well for a wife to know all the details, and to share all the drudgery of a priest's work." Besides, it must be remembered that she has duties to perform at home, which, if they are to be done properly, will take up the greater part, if not the whole, of her time. Indeed, supposing that a clergyman has a sufficient income to support a wife and family *with economy* (it is very rarely that more can be said than this), it may be assumed that, what with performing her duty to her children and attending to her other domestic matters, she will find quite enough to do at home without taking part in parish affairs; and that if she does go beyond her own immediate province, she will prove in the end a hindrance to her husband rather than a help. Considering the question of clerical marriage, then, in the light of supplying additional parochial agency, it would appear, when viewed from a common-sense stand point, to be entirely a mistake; and further, that a clergyman's working power, so far from being increased, is seriously diminished when he is a married man.

The Bishop of Ely makes some striking observations upon this head in the same chapter of his work from which a quotation was

given in the early part of this Paper. After remarking that GOD'S ministers should ever seek the more excellent way, he goes on to adduce the following motives of Church policy in favour of a celibate priesthood, which he considers ought not to be underrated:—"An unmarried clergyman is *expeditior*, more readily moved from place to place, abler to go where his duty may call him, to do what his duty may require of him. He has no children to think about, no wife to carry about with him, no interests but those of the Church, and the Church's Head. His strength, his wealth, his intellect, he may devote all to one end, for he has no need to have anxieties to provide for his own, or to preserve himself for their sakes. He has no temptation to heap up riches for others, none to form worldly schemes and seek worldly interests for the advancement of his family. 'He careth only for the things of the LORD, how he may please the LORD.'"

This is so good and so true, that little more need be said. As a corollary, however, to what the Bishop suggests as to the hindrance which children may prove to parochial work, the by no means unknown instances in which married priests have avoided infected houses and fever-stricken patients, through fear of conveying disease to the little ones at the parsonage, are worth consideration. It is obvious, too, that where a clergyman has a family in addition to his parish, he can scarcely attend properly to the one, without neglecting to some extent the duties which he owes to the other. In this respect his case is different from that of the professional man and man of business, who has, at any rate, his Sundays unoccupied, and, for the most part, his evenings free. But a priest is not a professional man nor a man of business. *A clergyman's work is never over;* and the temptation to give up that time to his wife and children which would otherwise be devoted to such works as Night Schools, Confirmation, Communion and Bible Classes, to say nothing of theological reading, is not a small one. As a practical illustration of this, I may mention that, whilst writing this portion of my Essay, I had a visit from a most hard-working country incumbent, who gave it as one of his chief reasons for discontinuing the Sunday evening service in his parish church, that it occupied the time and exhausted the energies which he thought it right to devote to the religious instruction of his family at home.

Another respect in which the existence of a wife at the parsonage is a hindrance to her husband's work, is in the matter of friendly visiting. There are many families in every good-sized parish with whom an unmarried priest could take a friendly meal, and by this means establish and maintain amicable relations, to

whose tables he can no longer go when he becomes a married man. They are perfectly fit associates (for the time being) for him, but they are not deemed proper companions for his wife, and a means of influence, which before was open to him, is henceforth closed. The fact also of there being at least twice the chance of misunderstandings arising between a clergyman and his parishioners when the former is no longer single, is a view of the question in its general aspect which should not be entirely disregarded.

An argument frequently urged in favour of a clergyman being married, is the advantage which must naturally accrue to the parish at large from the example of a devout and well-disciplined family at the parsonage. There is some difficulty in answering this; not, indeed, from any doubt which one can have as to the proper answer, but from the painful necessity of giving additional publicity to a very disagreeable fact, if the truth be spoken without reserve. That a well-regulated clergyman's family, when grown up, would be calculated to benefit a parish by the force of good example, no one can doubt; but is it the normal condition of such families to be well regulated? Is not the reverse notoriously the case? Without venturing to criticize the daughters at the Manse, I may fairly say a word or two about the sons. Let any one pick out the half-dozen most ill-conducted boys in the public school that he was at, or a similar number of the fastest men, in rather a low direction, that he was acquainted with at the University, and the chances are that a large proportion belonged to those families which are supposed to exercise so much beneficial influence in their respective parishes from their personal example. There is no occasion now to inquire into the reasons to be assigned for this. It is enough to state it as a fact which few would be disposed to gainsay; and it is so unpleasant a topic that the less that is said about it the better.

The celibacy of the clergy in its bearing upon missionary enterprise in foreign parts, is an item in our subject which must not be overlooked. With many, a wife is regarded as well-nigh indispensable to one who is about to engage in this peculiar branch of the Church's work, and a number of plausible arguments are adduced in support of the opinion. If examined, they will be found in reality to amount to little more than this—that a missionary is more comfortable with a wife than without one. Granted that this is so, it is fairly open to question, whether the personal comfort of the missionary is of such primary importance as some would make it, in a work whose object is to preach the doctrines of the Cross in heathen lands. Judging from what we read of S. John Baptist, of the seventy disciples, and of the

Apostles, we are led to believe (if I mistake not) that it was a spirit of self-sacrifice, and not one of self-indulgence, which won the first and greatest victories for CHRIST; and in after periods of the Church's history, it has ever been a similar spirit which has been followed by a similar success. The bare idea of such missionaries as S. Denys or S. Martin of Tours, S. Boniface or S. Francis Xavier indulging in the comforts of married life, is as absurd a one as can well be imagined; and yet these, and such as these, were the men who took heathendom by storm, men to whose mission-stations pagans flocked to Holy Baptism by thousands, and whose work, as compared with ours in the same direction, was as the labour of an adult to the trifling of a child.

Wives and families must ever prove a positive hindrance to such clergymen as are occupied in the work of converting the inhabitants of heathen nations to the Faith; and this for many and obvious reasons. It seems unnecessary to enlarge upon this head; for those which the Bishop of Ely so well suggests, and which have been quoted above, are even more applicable to clergymen engaged in Missions, than to those who are situated in parishes at home. Over and above these, however, there is one point worthy of consideration which may be mentioned—if mission work be pushed with activity and vigour, it must necessarily be at the risk of a certain amount of personal peril, either from the need of dwelling at times in unhealthy districts, or from attempting to deal with unfriendly and savage tribes. Common-sense tells us that celibates, who are free from the anxieties, the burdens, and the responsibilities incident to married life, are the proper men to undertake such work, and practically the only men who will undertake it. In any military campaign, if a storming party has to be organized, or a forlorn hope to be got together, it is naturally and most properly the single, and not the married, men who will present themselves as volunteers; and precisely the same principle will hold good in the aggressive war which the Catholic Church is pledged to wage against the powers of evil in the world. Hence, practically, single men are the only ones who will undertake missionary labour amongst the heathen; for there can be little doubt that, as regards the Church of England, the miserable insufficiency of missionary clergy is mainly owing to the prevalent idea, that every clergyman ought, as a matter almost of necessity, to be married; and the desire for an after-position of tolerable comfort, as the natural complement to this idea, not unreasonably deters them from a life which will possibly be perilous, and which must to a certainty be hard. So long as this excessive devotion to the comforts of matrimony,

on the part of our clergy, continues unabated; curacies "with the advantages of good society" will remain at their present high premium, and snug country parsonages, with "light duty" and "in good neighbourhoods" will be canvassed for as eagerly as ever, but missions to the heathen will be left to take care of themselves.

A single illustration will go far to show that this picture is not too highly coloured. In one of our Missions, when in its infancy, and when its bishop was standing well-nigh alone amongst the heathen and semi-heathen tribes to whom he had been sent, it so happened that he was deprived of the aid of three men simultaneously from this one cause alone. Two clergymen in England, who had promised their personal aid, withdrew from their engagements because the ladies, to whom they had become affianced in the interval, very naturally objected to such uninviting expatriation; while the third, who had gone out as a married man, was compelled to return to the old country, because, after the experience of a year or two, the new one did not prove agreeable to his wife. In our thriving colonies the rival claims of clerical marriage and celibacy stand upon pretty much the same footing as they do at home; but in the work of converting the heathen, we may take it as a certain truth, that until we have a very large staff of celibate clergy in the Church of England, the mission fields still open to us will be left unoccupied or nearly so, and our successes in those where work has already been begun, will, from sheer lack of labourers, continue to be—what they have been in years past.

The general subject of which this Paper treats is so large a one, when viewed in connection with the practical working and well-being of the Church of England, that amongst the many points deserving notice, it is difficult to know which to select, and which to leave untouched. In addition to those which have been mentioned, there are one or two others which may be indicated, though little more than a mere indication of their bearing can be given. For example, the encouragement of sounder views with regard to celibacy would inspire people with a deeper disgust for flirting and fortune-hunting clergymen, and tend to thin their numbers —clerical ladies'-men—modern editions (I mean) of the men who were not unknown even in the fourth century, and against whom we find S. Jerome warning the Virgin Eustochium in the following terms:—"Their chief care is to be well dressed, neatly shod, and perfumed; they curl their hair with irons, they have bright rings on their fingers, and they walk on tiptoe, looking more like young bridegrooms than clerks. Some of them make it their only business to know the names and dwellings of ladies of

quality, and discover their inclinations, &c., &c." Again, the comparative independence which a celibate enjoys, when hostile pressure is brought to bear upon him, by reason of his faithful administration of the Church's discipline or his fearless defence of Catholic truth, is an aspect of the subject which troubles, supposed by some to be impending, naturally suggest to thoughtful minds. Willingness to bear the part of confessor, if needs be, in the cause of the Church, must be seriously modified by the reflection that thereby a wife and family must to a certainty share the suffering, and may very possibly be reduced to want.

And again, as to the application of ecclesiastical emoluments. That these were intended solely for Church purposes, nobody can doubt. Whatever surplus chanced to remain over and above the sum needed for the support of the parish priest, would clearly be supposed to go towards the maintenance of some religious work. On what principle Church money can rightly be devoted to the support of wife and children, and to the purchase of such things as bonnets, parasols, and perambulators, is more than I can tell; but every body knows that the drainage in such directions must be attended with very serious loss to the cause of charity and religion. Had William of Wykeham been a married man, it may reasonably be doubted whether the noble institution which is inseparably connected with his name, and its still more illustrious fellow on the banks of the Isis, would have existed now as witnesses to the generosity of him to whom they owe their being. It can hardly be seriously maintained, that large endowments were intended to minister to the additional temporal luxury of the incumbent, rather than to supply additional spiritual advantages to the parish thus endowed. The popular idea that, whereas a vicar with a living of £500 a year must be content with a couple of maid-servants, and an occasional hired fly, the rector with a benefice worth £1500 will necessarily have his private carriage, with coachman in livery to boot, is so manifestly unsound (not to use a stronger term), that it would be waste of time to undertake its refutation.

A very common, and at first sight a very specious objection to the general principle adopted in this Paper, requires an answer before it be closed. It is urged, that the encouragement of celibacy argues a low estimation of matrimony as a holy and honourable state of life, instituted by God, and in a peculiar manner exalted by being made a type of CHRIST'S union with His Church. But when it is considered, that those who place the highest value upon religious celibacy happen to be the men who at the same time regard marriage as a Sacrament, whilst the opponents of

the celibate life place matrimony in a far lower rank amongst Church ordinances, the objection can scarcely be reckoned as one of any great weight.

A very few more words must suffice. It may perhaps be thought, that the pleas which have been urged in favour of the celibacy of the clergy, are a strange commentary upon the evidence which the previous historical summary gave of certain ill-consequences which ensued upon it in times gone by. But the voluntary adoption of this life for which I plead, as contrasted with the enforced submission to it on the part of the clergy, is that which makes all the difference, when the question is regarded from this point of view. Encourage a man to embrace the higher life, but leave him to judge for himself as to his fitness for it, and let religious, no less than financial considerations, assist in determining his choice; and then we need have but little fear that evils will arise. Still there are, doubtless, many who would shrink from giving encouragement to this principle, on prudential and moral grounds. They regard the fair fame of the Church of England as inseparably bound up with the prevailing practice of its clergy, and deem that marriage is the great safeguard against evil. It is, however, worth notice, that so far from clerical scandals being confined to the unmarried clergy, in the cases which are made public, the accused, at least as often as not, turns out to be a married man. Indeed, if I mistake not, the proportion of married to unmarried clerical delinquents is about the same as that of married to unmarried clergymen; and that, in reality, marriage will be found not to affect the question at all. It would be only fair to consider further, that a religious celibate is not *merely* an unmarried man.

Notwithstanding many obstacles which necessarily stand in the way of any very widely-spread practical acceptance of the celibate life by our English clergy, the idea that there may be, and perhaps will be, a considerable body of such priests at work in our parishes in the course of a few years, is not so fanciful a one as some persons might suppose. A strong feeling in this direction already exists in the minds of many of the younger clergy, who belong to that school of thought which the Bishop of London tells us supplies the most hard-working and self-denying men to the Church. And further, it may not be generally known how rapidly the conviction is spreading amongst the more thoughtful of the laity, that if the "home heathen" are to be efficiently dealt with by the Church of England, some other agency must be employed than that of clergy subject to the manifold distractions of family life. To speak from personal experi-

ence, I may say, that I have heard laymen expressing their opinion as to the importance of Clerical Celibacy more strongly even than priests who, in support of the principles set forth in this Paper, have bound themselves to a single life by vow. That there are some spheres of duty, and some classes of Church people which are more suited to, and more influenced by, the ministrations of a married clergy, may be freely conceded; but, on the other hand, there are many positions in which a celibate, *cæteris paribus*, is the proper man if real telling work is to be done. And as higher views of ministerial responsibilities, and more genuine yearnings to win souls for CHRIST obtain a wider acceptance amongst the clergy of the Church of England, such earnestness must necessarily take this form more and more. That it has not done so to any great extent already, must be attributed to the fact that the minds of devoted men have been too little directed in this channel, and that the tone of popular feeling has hitherto been strongly against the adoption of celibacy. Experience would tend to show that a much larger number of men than is commonly supposed might live as celibates, if they chose to do so, apart from the special grace which GOD would give to such as voluntarily embraced the higher life. The studious and sedentary are by no means naturally best fitted for the unmarried state; yet the Fellows of many of our Colleges are known to live on thus year after year during the most trying portion of their lives: and it is not too much to assert, that what one body of men can and will do for the sake of income, another body of men may do for the love of CHRIST.

JAMES EDWARD VAUX.

Re-union of the Church.

About twenty years ago, an Association was formed for the purpose of effecting a union among members of various Protestant sects at home and abroad; it was called, "The Evangelical Alliance." Its proceedings made a very considerable noise at the time, and every where attracted attention. Its meetings were noticed in most of the newspapers, and the speeches of the members reported. It was joined by a few clergymen and more laymen, but its principal strength lay in the number of Dissenting ministers. Of late its proceedings have been hardly noticed in any of the Church papers. Many persons are scarcely aware of its existence, and few, probably, know that the nineteenth annual conference of this Alliance was held on September 26th, 1865, at Hull. The Alliance is still joined by a few clergymen, but has long ceased to have any influence in the Church. The principal cause of failure is not far to seek: the Alliance has no creed. On the contrary, one of its fundamental rules is, that the members of the different sects who join it are to retain their own peculiarities of belief; even priests of the Church, who have subscribed the creed of S. Athanasius, are admissible. A society composed of such discordant elements as these, cannot amalgamate: it is an image of iron and clay, and it carries with it the causes of its own dissolution. But the Alliance goes further; it studiously ignores the Catholic Church; it refuses communion with members of the Greek and Roman branches, and admits only such of the Anglican as repudiate the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.

The history of the Evangelical Alliance is instructive, even if it be only the history of a failure, since it serves to show that reunion must lie in another direction. But it proves more than this: it proves the inherent weakness of division, and the sense which those who keep up division have of the falseness of their position, and their secret discontent at it. If separation into sects be good, why seek to set up an Alliance? If an Alliance be good, why continue to keep up sects? Still more, the Alliance is only one of individuals, not of communities; it is not an Alliance of, say the sect of Methodists with that of the Inde-

pendents; but only of certain members of the one with certain members of the other. It is not even a re-union of what the Alliance terms "Evangelical Christendom," exclusive of the Catholic Church: it is only a partial re-union of certain individual members for a certain specified purpose. It never, as far as we are informed, even contemplated the possibility of, *e. g.*, every Baptist meeting-house being open to every Independent minister to preach and minister its rites, or any Quaker meeting-house being the scene of an adult or infant baptism; though possibly, in another sense altogether, several of the members do contemplate the occupation of the pulpits of the Church by Dissenters. The failure of the Alliance teaches us wherein alone to look for re-union, not in the sects, but in the Catholic Church. Negatively, it establishes the fact, that in order to effect re-union, there must be a common creed, and a common ministry. We use the word *re-union* emphatically, to distinguish from any other process, such as absorption; a stronger body may *absorb* a weaker, by the latter giving up its distinctive principles, and adopting those of the stronger; but re-union can only take place where each separated body, having one common foundation, unites upon it, retaining only national or local peculiarities. Propositions have been made from time to time in Convocation, by Chancellor Massingberd, of Lincoln, to enter into formal negotiation with Wesleyan Methodists, to induce a return of that body to the Church. Were this successful, this process would be absorption, not re-union. It would not be to put their ministers on an equality with the clergy, or to make their meeting-houses into parish churches. It would be to absorb, in each parish, the members of the Wesleyan body into the Church. On the other hand, re-union means the re-establishment of communion between divided portions of the same body, and the perfect equality of the respective ministers of each, as well as a mutual participation of sacraments, with the confession of a common faith.

We must be careful in fully understanding, that this last does not by any means imply that the ritual of every branch of the Church should be exactly identical. On the contrary, such union is compatible with the greatest diversity in the form of worship, in ceremonies, and in general management. There are certain things essential, as the form of words in the Sacraments: other parts are variable, according to local tradition. For example, in administering the Sacrament of Baptism, it is essential that it be done in the Name of the Holy TRINITY; but it is not essential to the validity of the Sacrament, that the preceding words

be addressed to the recipient in the indicative or the imperative mood. The form in the Western Church is, "I baptize thee"; in the Eastern, "Be thou baptized." Both forms are equally valid; but the form which is now becoming common among Dissenters, "I baptize thee in the *Name of the* LORD JESUS," is invalid, and renders re-baptism necessary. In a word, it is not a Sacrament at all, since it is essential that the person should be baptized into the name of each Person of the Holy TRINITY and not of One only.

The two principal points, on which all the rest really turn, are those of Orders and Creed. Where Orders are not valid, there can be no branch of the Catholic Church; where the Creed is heretical, the branch is cut off from the Catholic Church, though outwardly it retains the form. Thus, the three branches of the Catholic Church, are the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican; because they each, though at present estranged from one another, retain the essentials of the Church in faith and order. In the East, there are other bodies, which have retained the form and order of the Catholic Church, but which have corrupted the Creed by the adoption of some heresy. Thus, the Syrian Jacobites retain the whole framework of the Church entire and unbroken, but they have adopted a doctrine on the Nature of CHRIST Incarnate, which the Catholic Church has condemned. In the West, schism has generally taken the form of a denial of the Apostolic Order of the Episcopate and Priesthood as indelible, and of Divine appointment, and a substituting of a ministry merely human and temporary. It will follow then, necessarily, that if a reconciliation of these bodies with the Church ever be effected, the process will be wholly dissimilar. It will help us to understand the whole question better, if we illustrate the two cases. Suppose, then, that a reconciliation was proposed between the Anglo-Catholic Church and the Jacobite community. All that would be required to put the latter in a position for re-union, would be the adoption of the orthodox Creed, and the erasing and changing all expressions in its liturgy and ritual which savoured of heresy. The Orders of the Jacobite Church, though schismatical, are still valid, and therefore there would need no re-ordination, nor re-organization of the community: by renouncing its heresy, it is simply re-admitted into the Communion of the Body of CHRIST.

But if it had been the Scottish Established Kirk that desired reconciliation, the process would be wholly different. This community, having formally renounced the divine order and appointment of the ministry of the Catholic Church, and having

established a ministry of mere human appointment and authority, there could not be re-union without entire reconstruction. Not only would the parish minister have to acknowledge the divine authority of the Bishops for the future; but each minister would himself have to be ordained by a Bishop before he could administer the Sacraments and rites of the Church. Reconstruction must take place, before re-union can be accomplished.

The last case to consider, is that of the re-union of the three branches of the Church which are now unhappily estranged. Each professing the same Creed, each possessing the same Orders, one would think re-union here would be the easiest of all; but experience tells us that the quarrels between the nearest relations are always the most bitter, and re-union the most difficult.

In order to comprehend this case, we must enter upon a more exact statement of the nature of the Catholic Church and its branches, as well as the various theories of those outside her pale—the idea of the Catholic Church, and the theory of Protestant communities. The theory of the latter requires a disbelief in the doctrine of the visible Church; that is, in a divinely instituted Body and an equally divinely-appointed government of the visible Body; it requires a denial of the fact that our LORD appointed a Priesthood in His Church, whose office is to celebrate those "mysteries" which are the means and channels of grace and communion between CHRIST and His Body. Nay, it denies that the Body itself is a visible community or kingdom, separated from the rest of mankind by the partaking of, or communicating in, these Sacraments. On the contrary, the notion seems to be, that the Church is not strictly a Body, but an aggregation of individuals who hold a certain theological or philosophical system, gathered out of the Holy Scriptures; that certain truths are revealed in the Scriptures, which truths were systematized by certain learned men in the sixteenth century; and that a belief in these truths constitutes the membership with CHRIST, irrespective of the visible Body and the Sacraments. This is the objective aspect.

Besides this, there is the subjective aspect: a certain consciousness of personal interest in these truths, and a sense of general unworthiness, and a further sense of the removal of that unworthiness in the belief and apprehension of these truths—the whole matter of salvation being a personal one, between the individual and CHRIST the SAVIOUR—and that for purposes of mutual edification and advantage, it is expedient that individuals should unite into distinct bodies or communities, appoint their own teachers, frame their own terms of

communion, and administer their own ordinances. Admitting for the most part—not universally—the divine authority of the two greater Sacraments, a form of Baptism is used, and a form of Communion in bread and wine; but these are not really Sacramental in the sense that the Church holds them, as means of grace to the recipients; but rather as seals and pledges of grace *already* given, outward signs of GOD'S SPIRIT *already* bestowed, on the part of GOD, and signs of faith in His promises, or rather, the fulfilment of His promises, on the part of the recipient.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not speaking of the formularies of the different Protestant sects, as if such a theory is contained in them, we are speaking of the views of Protestants at the present time; for the majority has departed very far from the older standards. For instance, take that community which has the most stringent formulary and the most elaborate organization—the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland. In the formularies of this body, the doctrine of the Sacraments is very different from what we have described above, though the real doctrine is overshadowed by, and brought into subjection to, the primary doctrine of Predestination and Reprobation, which, of course, nullifies the idea of their being means of grace, excepting to the elect; and, still further, by the adoption of Calvin's theory that Sacraments are "seals" of GOD'S promises already given, not means of communicating their own proper grace. At the present day, even this modified form is departed from; for it is not an exaggeration to say that not two-thirds of the children of Presbyterian parents in Scotland are baptized: in America, probably not one-half of all the sects. This fearful state of things arises from the doctrine about "Faith." Faith is required previous to the reception of the Sacraments. In the case of infants, that of parents is substituted; when, therefore, parents are ungodly, or even careless, their faith is not sufficient, and sponsors, other than parents, not being allowed, the children are left to grow up unbaptized. The following fact, the truth of which the writer of this Essay himself vouches for, will show clearly the views held, even by ministers, on this point:—A man presented himself to his minister as desirous to communicate at the next administration; but stated, as a possible objection, that he had not been baptized. The minister informed him that the objection was quite immaterial; either Sacrament would do, provided he had faith. We repeat, then, that the idea held by Protestants of the present day really amounts to this—That there is no such thing as a visible Church; but there is in the world a body of elect members, known to GOD only, who shall finally

be saved; and that these, and these only, form the Church of CHRIST: that the union with CHRIST consists chiefly, if not wholly, in holding certain doctrines of Justification by faith alone in the Atonement of CHRIST, together with a belief in GOD's promises as set forth in Scripture: and that, consequently, the whole matter is a private and personal one between each individual and CHRIST, quite independent of the belonging to the visible Church, or any sect. In accordance with this, we hear everywhere proclaimed the doctrine of a Universal Priesthood—every man is his own priest, and, in some sects, every woman her own priestess—but that it tends to good order and mutual advantage, that individuals thinking alike should unite in some one community or other, choose their own teachers, and frame rules for general government and conduct; that the gifts of grace are not attached to any outward form or ordinance, excepting perhaps that of preaching, but that they are a private concern between GOD and the individual; that the highest form that grace manifests itself, is in the knowledge of Scripture and of Protestant doctrine, and especially in the power of preaching.

In direct opposition to this, is the idea of the Catholic Church, the leading features of which may be stated in the following propositions:—And first, that it is a spiritual system, not an intellectual one; a system whose purpose is a re-union of man with GOD, through the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Holy TRINITY. That this union is not effected by merely believing in a certain system of theology, or in the Revelation of GOD in the Bible; but, being essentially spiritual, only effected through those means by which spiritual gifts are conveyed to man. That those means are the Sacraments, which may be termed "extensions of the Incarnation," or means whereby the benefits of the Incarnation are applied to man. That such a union is, in most cases, and at first, independent and irrespective of any exercise of the intellect on the part of the person brought into union, but is by means of the gift of GOD in CHRIST's own appointed way—Holy Baptism. That that Sacrament is the means of conferring on the recipient a new and spiritual life, similar and parallel to the natural life into which every infant enters at birth; so that it is called regeneration, or the new birth: and that one great object of the Church is to feed, support, educate, this spiritual life till it comes to the "measure of the fulness of the stature of CHRIST." That the Church is the body of persons possessing this life, and consequently wholly distinct from the "world" without; it is, therefore, a visible body with an invisible life, and that the means of support for this

invisible life is invisible grace conveyed through visible forms or signs, instituted and appointed of CHRIST for that purpose. That the whole being of the Church rests on the Incarnation, or rather, to speak properly, on the SON of GOD become Man. CHRIST is "the Head of the Body, the Church" (Col. i. 18). That in order to the extension and communication of this spiritual life and grace, our Divine LORD appointed a ministry in His Church, whose office it is to administer the means of grace to its members; so that it is His work, though done by the hands of His ministers and ambassadors: consequently, no one can take this office on himself without a direct commission from CHRIST. That He appointed His disciples, in the first place, to be Apostles, with a power to transmit their commission to others, as the needs of the Body required; and that without this commission, no acts are valid, and no ordinances have any assurance of grace attached to them. That the Episcopate and Priesthood is not only a form of Church government most nearly after the model of Scripture; but it is the one only of divine appointment in the Body, the one only which has the promise of grace attached to it, the one only which has the stamp of the divine commission.

The Protestant assertion that ministers are mere delegates of, and therefore are elected and commissioned by, the congregation, at once completely overturns the whole constitution of the Church, reverses the divine order, and substitutes human authority for that of CHRIST. Thus the "Communion of Saints" becomes not only a matter of general advantage, but a necessity; so completely is the one Body made up of its several parts, and so interdependent is each part on the other, that when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it; when one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Nay more, communion with the Head is in a great measure dependant on fellowship with the members; we then "have fellowship one with another, and the Blood of JESUS CHRIST cleanseth us from all sin." The Body is dependent on the ministry, and the ministry is ordained for the Body, mutual fellowship and communion is requisite for the perfect growth in grace. Thus the Catholic idea is, that union and communion with the Church is absolutely necessary for union and communion with CHRIST; and that persons are received into communion with the Church in order to union with CHRIST; and, further, that this communion is effected by a communication of a spiritual gift, an actual bestowal of the grace of GOD to the person through this ministration of the Church's ordinances; that thus communion with the Church

implies and connotes union with CHRIST, as well as supplies the means of such union.

On the other hand, the Protestant theory reverses this; making an intellectual process called Faith, and a mental conviction, called apprehension of CHRIST by faith, to be the means—not the condition, but the means—of effecting this union with CHRIST, it puts out of sight the fact that a special gift of the Spirit is necessary to create a union; or, perhaps, we shall describe the theory more correctly if we say, that it supposes grace to be an intellectual process going on in the mind, whereby a certain effect called Faith is produced; and that the production of this mental effect accomplishes the union between the individual and CHRIST; that any communion with fellow-Christians is subsequent to this, not necessary in itself, but productive of good to the individual in a secondary and inferior way. Thus, according to this theory, the existence of the Church is no way necessary. It may be believed in as an abstract proposition, but its existence, and communion with it, are quite immaterial.

From the Catholic idea of the Church, naturally follows the Catholic doctrine of its essential unity; "I believe in One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church," is the confession of the whole Church of CHRIST. But, from the divided state we are now in, it is most difficult to comprehend the doctrine it teaches and the truth it declares. It is, however, absolutely necessary to define it strictly before we can enter upon the question of re-union. No definition of this unity can be more strict than that of S. Paul—"One Body, one Spirit . . . one hope of our calling, one LORD, one Faith, one Baptism, one GOD and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." A unity of faith and a unity of constitution are predicated here, both of which are essential to the idea of the oneness of the Body. The former is defined in the Creeds and the decrees of the Six General Councils; the latter is found in the universal practice of the one Body. We shall not attempt to prove either of these from Holy Scripture; for we must bear in mind, that both the faith of the Church and her visible constitution were complete and in full force before a single word of the New Testament Scriptures was written. We find plenty of allusions to such a faith and such a constitution in the New Testament, for the writers had both before their eyes; but we shall not find them specificately enunciated. We may as well expect to find among the Anglo-Saxon laws a carefully drawn-up scheme of the constitutional government of England. The governing power in this country was the king and his nobles; the laws everywhere acknowledge this,

but they nowhere define it. So in Holy Scripture, the Church is everywhere acknowledged; but its constitution is nowhere defined. Paper constitutions are not uncommon in our days; but then they only occur when a new State or a new Government has been formed to supersede an older one. So the Protestants of the sixteenth century constructed paper constitutions of what they called Church government, when they formed a new community on the ruins of the older society. No State forms a paper constitution whilst the old one is in force and acknowledged; and we shall not therefore expect to find any such paper constitution of the Catholic Church in the New Testament.

In the matter of the Church's faith, Creeds were not elaborated until some portion of the one Faith was denied. The first confession of faith agreed on by the whole Church—the Nicene Creed—was drawn up with especial reference to the Arian heresy; and even then the compilers nowhere professed to draw it from the New Testament. They put in dogmatical form the traditionary teaching of the Catholic Church, and only appealed to Scripture for confirmation of their position. So, also, in the subsequent councils which condemned the Macedonian, Eutychian, and Nestorian heresies, the Fathers only expressed the Catholic Faith as traditionally held. Nowhere in Scripture do we find the word "TRINITY;" nowhere is it dogmatically laid down that the HOLY GHOST is a Person; and that there are two Natures, two Wills, in the one Person in CHRIST; yet the Church did not hesitate to declare these to be essential doctrines, and to anathematize those who denied them. These matters having been settled by General Councils, received the assent of the whole Catholic Church; and though communion between portions of the one Body has unhappily been suspended, yet each portion holds firmly the one faith, once delivered to the saints, as enunciated and settled by the Six General Councils. Thus the one Faith is the faith of the whole Church.

In the matter of the constitution of the Church, we shall see the like fact. There is only one Body, one Spirit, and one Baptism, even though intercommunion between certain portions is interrupted. The quarrels of individuals or communities cannot make void the institution of CHRIST, any more than can family quarrels destroy family relationship. Two sons are still brothers, though they may have each vowed the other's death: no enmity of theirs can break the relationship. So the most deadly hatred between portions of the one Body—refusal to communicate—cannot make them cease to be portions of the one Body; for the unity consists in something far deeper than human

passions and failings. The Body is one because the Head is one, and the Spirit that animates the Body is one. CHRIST is not divided, even though His followers fight with each other; the HOLY SPIRIT ceases not to be one because men cease to hold communion with each other. So then, as long as the essential faith and the essential constitution of the Church are preserved in the various portions, so long there is essential unity; disunion, dis-communion, do not necessarily destroy unity. The Priesthood of the Church is one, because it is commissioned by the one High Priest, CHRIST; the Sacraments are one, because the SPIRIT which animates them is one; the Faith is one, for it was settled by Councils of the whole Church, and is received by all portions of the Church. Thus, the Greek, the Roman, the Anglican, are all portions of the one Catholic Church, because they hold the common Faith; and they retain the one Priesthood, and consequently are still one Body, though intercommunion is interrupted. But the Nestorian and Eutychian communities in the East, though they have, and still do retain, the one Priesthood, yet are separated from, and form no portion of, the one Body, because they hold not the one Faith. So, also, the Protestant bodies in Europe form no portion of the one Body, because they have renounced the one Priesthood. They established a system independent of the Church, external, and even hostile to it: consequently, they have cut themselves off from the participation of the one SPIRIT as living in the Church and flowing through the Sacraments, which are the veins and arteries of the one Body[1].

We insist very strongly on this point, both because it is essential to the understanding of the subject, and because it is so difficult to realize. Englishmen, from their insular position, and from the isolation which has long been the characteristic of their branch of the Catholic Church, have systematically ignored the fact of the essential Oneness of the Body of CHRIST. The long estrangement from the Oriental branch, and the deadly feud with the Roman, have forced them to take a false position, and to defend and justify it, until at last they have made up their minds to consider themselves and their community as alone the true Church of CHRIST, and all other branches so sunk and degraded by miserable superstition as to be unworthy of the

[1] We do not intend to enter into the question as to how far the individual members of these communities receive grace, which is a point beyond our present purpose. We are discussing the question of the "Re-union of the Church," not the re-union of Christendom. For this reason we purposely avoid hazarding conjecture on the efficacy of schismatical and lay Baptism. It is outside our inquiry.

name. This, with a tendency to look on the period of the Reformation, when the feud commenced between the Roman and Anglican Branches, as the most glorious epoch in Church history; nay, considered by many as the true birth of the "Church of England"—or, as our grandfathers were proud to call it, "Our Protestant Church"—has obliterated the Catholic idea of the Church of CHRIST, and reduced it to the semblance of a mere sect, better than, but only slightly differing from, the Protestant sects abroad. Most providentially, the Ecclesiastical Courts, in certain respects, held the true idea; and, in one instance, at least, regularly acted upon it. In the case of Orders, priests ordained by Greek and Roman bishops have always been regarded as such by us; and, on conforming to our Ritual and Articles, have been admitted both to the privileges and benefices of the Anglican community; while so-called "Protestant Orders" have been—except in a few instances, during the times of confusion in the sixteenth century—as universally repudiated.

As soon, then, as we have mastered this true idea of the unity of the Body of CHRIST, and not till then, we are prepared to enter upon the question of Re-union. When we have realized the truth, that unity consists in the incorporation of the Body with CHRIST as the Head, with the maintaining of the Faith and the constitution given it by CHRIST; that the HOLY SPIRIT is the Life of the Body; that it is not a mere theological system, but a living Body animated by the Living SPIRIT of GOD; not a voluntary association of individuals, but *the* company of the Elect, those called and chosen of GOD—admitted into the privileges of the Body by a divinely-ordained Sacrament of initiation; and that no dissensions between individuals, no breach of intercommunion, can *per se* destroy this unity; then, and not till then, are we qualified to consider the question of Re-union.

Let it also be perfectly understood that re-union does not imply absorption of one body into another, not the supremacy of one body over another, not the surrender of the rights and privileges of one body to another, but only a restoration of intercommunion between portions of the One Body long estranged from each other. The first step to such intercommunion would be the admission of members of either communion to the Sacraments of the other, on similar terms to those on which each communion admits its own members. Such a step as this needs no protocols, no formally drawn-up and signed concordats, no renunciations on either side, nothing but the confession of a common Faith, and an acquiescence in national customs. This is all we ask for at present; the further and complete step of mutual appoint-

ments to ecclesiastical offices is one which would require on both sides the concurrence of the civil power. The first is a purely spiritual act, needing only the consent of the higher ecclesiastics, without any reference to the civil status of each community. The latter involves civil rights, guarded by the civil legislature. We shall be content at present to consider only the first.

It would be travelling out of our course to enter into a history of causes which effected the unhappy divisions in the one Church. It will be sufficient to say that the alienation of the West from the East took place in the tenth century, and the hostility was made permanent by the establishment of the Latin empire at Constantinople. It is true, that a sort of concordat was patched up at the Council of Florence, but it never practically took effect. The further division of the Western Church in the sixteenth century is too well known to need more than a statement of the fact. What we have to do with here, is the fact of the existence of these divisions, and to deal with the Church as it is. The Roman branch is bitterly hostile to the Greek and Anglican, and these two in return equally reciprocate the feeling. Disputes, discussions, have gone on for, say, three hundred years; thousands of sermons, pamphlets, books, have been written and published during this period; hard names have been freely thrown at each other, many evil motives imagined, every crime imputed; the warfare goes on still, and certainly in some quarters does not seem to abate. Let us pause in the midst of the strife. Let us calmly survey the battle field, and ask—What have we gained by all this? What has the Kingdom of CHRIST gained? What has the highest Christian grace—*Charity*—gained?

We have lately witnessed the end of the most terrible civil war that has ever been carried on in modern times. We are now able to survey the conqueror and the conquered. We read the returns of the killed and the disabled; and we also hear of the heart-rending accounts of the desolation, the misery, the wretchedness caused by—victory. Now sit down and count the gains. What are they? The North has subdued the South. What are the fruits of this vast conquest? We are told the emancipation of the black man; at best a doubtful advantage, so far as the well-being of the Union is concerned, and certainly the price paid is something appalling to look at. Equally wasteful, equally unprofitable, equally destructive of spiritual life, of piety towards GOD and charity to our neighbour, has been the religious strife of the last three hundred years; and we ask—What is there gained? We receive this answer—Liberty of conscience, and the emancipation of the intellect of men from the thraldom of spiritual slavery.

We have not yet seen what emancipation of the negro will

do for America; but we have seen, and do see, what the so-called emancipation of the intellect has done for Protestants. It has produced all the heresy, and schism, and infidelity of the last three hundred years, from Martin Luther to Joe Smith. Germany and Geneva are no silent witnesses of the effect of Protestant controversy. What roused the religious spirit a few years ago in England, but the attempt to carry liberty of conscience and emancipation of the intellect into the *cathedra* of a Bishop and the chairs of the Universities? What is it that makes strifes and heartburnings in every parish in England at the holy season when the Church of CHRIST is celebrating His highest act of love towards mankind in His death and resurrection? What but so-called liberty of conscience and emancipation of the intellect? These are the precious fruits of controversy, of religious warfare, of maintaining the grand principles of Protestantism. Is it not a fact, that when once the demon of controversy takes possession of a man, it drives out all the higher Christian graces, and the highest of all especially—charity? Some painter produced a picture, "The Day after the Victory;" some glorious victory, when England rejoiced, and when church bells were rung, cannons were fired, and men shouted for joy. The picture was a fair landscape, blotched and blurred with dead and dying men, broken weapons, severed limbs; the only moving beings were the ambulance men and hospital corps, carrying away the wounded and dying. Yes, the conqueror was there too, surveying the scene, and he confessed that the next most terrible thing to defeat is—victory. And we are told that, ever since the great controversy began between Protestants and Catholics, constant victory has always followed the steps of the Protestant polemic. What, then, we repeat, are his gains since the commencement of the war in the sixteenth century? We pause for a reply. It is easier to count his losses. Bohemia, the birthplace of Huss and Jerome, is now intensely Roman; Belgium is Roman; large portions of once Protestant Germany are Roman. Protestant controversy has not stopped the advancing tide of Roman missions.

To come nearer home. There has been an endless controversy between the two branches of CHRIST's one Church—the Anglican and the Roman. What has it done for either? Has all this fierce controversy, this immense expenditure of time and mental power converted the opponents—brought souls to CHRIST? Has it not rather served to embitter Christians toward each other, and turned the Gospel of Peace into an instrument of discord? Hatred, variance, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, S. Paul tells us, are the works of the flesh, not of the Spirit of CHRIST; and

such have been, and still are, the fruits of controversy as carried on between Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics. Anglo-Catholics have called the Pope Antichrist, and the Man of Sin; Roman Catholics have retorted by calling Anglicans Heretics, Schismatics, Infidels. Has the calling of these hard names had the effect of convincing either? Has it not rather had the natural result of so prejudicing each other, that neither will consent calmly to examine the other's true position. S. Paul argued with the Jews: when they refused to listen to him, he turned to the Gentiles. He did not prolong a useless controversy. Better, far better, would it have been, if our great divines, instead of wasting their spiritual energies in an endless controversy with Rome, had turned them to the conversion of the mass of heathenism at their own doors, in their own parishes. Better too, surely, if they had employed their spiritual powers towards the establishment of peace. In all earthly warfare, conditions of peace are the natural result of victory. We shall do well to follow such example. Surely it was not to promote the spirit of controversy that the Incarnate SAVIOUR is styled "The Prince of Peace." Surely it was not to make room for the demon of discord that our Blessed LORD offered up His fervent prayer, "that all may be one." Surely He meant something different from the Protestant controversialist, when He said—"Blessed are the peacemakers."

We rejoice, then, when we see on all sides of us, in the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church, this hope, this earnest desire, for peace and union. No more hopeful sign attends the great Catholic revival of the nineteenth century than the cry for re-union. It shows that Englishmen are sick and disgusted with the unchristian aspect of a divided Church; that the Spirit of CHRIST is indeed stirring them up to pray and to labour for peace. We shall indeed be thankful if our poor efforts, our imperfect words, will help on toward a realization of such hopes.

We said above that the Roman Branch of the Church is at enmity with the other two—the Greek and the Anglican, and that, generally, the feeling is reciprocated equally by them; but there has been no such feeling between the Greek and the Anglican. There has been much *misunderstanding*, but no hostility. Naturally the first movement towards union should commence in this direction; and so it has. We have an Association for the purpose of promoting Union with the Eastern Church; meetings are held, attended, and presided over by Anglican bishops; Russian noblemen, Russian priests, attend and speak, and suggest means to carry out this thrice-blessed project. Nay, Convocation is not

silent. A divine spirit is surely brooding over the troubled waters of religious strife, and calming their fury.

This is not, however, the first time that the attempt at union has been made. In the last century, the reign of the Czar Peter the Great is remarkable for the commencement of negotiations for union. Peter was a reformer in his way. He established the Most Holy Governing Synod as the supreme ecclesiastical power in Russia, instead of the Patriarch. He induced the Patriarch of Constantinople to dispense with re-baptism in case of marriages with Protestants. It was in his time that a certain Egyptian Bishop, travelling in England, suggested to the Anglican bishops the idea of union with the East, and was actually the bearer of a letter from them to the Patriarch. The latter, rendered cautious by the example of Cyril Lucar, who had adopted Calvinistic opinions, gave little encouragement to the scheme. The Holy Synod of Russia was equally cautious; and before proper explanations could be made, Peter died, and this plan came to nought. Another attempt was made by the Bishops of the Scottish Church. This also failed.

These failures were owing chiefly to the false position which the Anglican bishops voluntarily assumed. They allowed themselves to be styled Protestants; and by using this name they gave occasion to the Orientals and Russians to conclude that the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church was nothing more nor better than a mere schismatical sect, like Lutherans or Calvinists. By the adoption of this term, the Greek or Russian ecclesiastic immediately conceives the idea that we have renounced both Apostolic order in the constitution of the Church, and Apostolic faith in our confessions. We heard a Russian nobleman say, only last year, that so long as we called ourselves by this name, and our chaplains in Russia allowed the appellation, so long union was almost impossible. The assuming of the name and character of Catholic would probably do more to prepare the way for union than any thing else.

There are, however, certain points of doctrine that need explanation before there can be any thing like a re-union between the separated branches of the Church, as well as others belonging to discipline. The doctrinal points between the Greek and Roman Churches, as given by Roman writers, are chiefly these:—1. The Procession of the Holy Spirit. 2. The Supremacy of the Pope. 3. Purgatory. Those of discipline are usually reckoned to be seven:—1. The use of leaven in the Eucharistic bread. 2. The Form of Holy Baptism. 3. The Marriage of Priests. 4. The wearing of the beard by the clergy. 5. The Fast of Wednesday

and Saturday. 6. The Mode of Genuflexion and Crossing. 7. The Communicating Infants. Of the former, the Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT alone concerns us: of the latter, we are alike in Nos. 1 and 3; perhaps now, we may say, in No. 4 also. The difference in the administration of Baptism consists in this—the Greeks practise total immersion, and that three times. Probably there would not be much difficulty with us in this matter. Immersion is prescribed by the Anglican ritual, affusion only permitted. Trine affusion is becoming more generally the custom. Besides this, the Russian has already allowed of affusion, by not requiring the re-baptization of Protestants. Mutual toleration of national customs would make Nos. 5, 6, and 7 no bar to intercommunion. If we add to this list Communion in both Kinds, we see another point of agreement between ourselves and the East. The great difficulty of all, is the doctrine of the Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT, and the insertion of *Filioque* in the Constantinopolitan Creed. These two points are not perfectly identical, though closely connected; for, even if both East and West were agreed as to doctrine, the first would still object to any addition to the Creed, except by a General Council.

In discussing this question of doctrine, we shall take our account from Roman writers, especially following Pitzipios, the founder of the *Société Chrétienne Orientale*, whose work is printed by the Propaganda at Rome.

First, then, on the addition to the Creed. The word *Filioque* was first added to the Confession of Faith at the Council of Toledo, to resist the heresies of the Arians and others that existed in Spain. This Council was held in A.D. 448, with the approbation of S. Leo, who was the author of the celebrated letter to the Council of Chalcedon, held three years later. From what we can learn, the Spanish Council never intended this word to become a portion of the Creed of the Universal Church, but added it solely to meet local emergencies. It passed, however, in the following century into France, thence into Germany. It was not added to the Creed as sung at Rome until 1015, under Benedict VIII.

The first collision of the Greeks with the Latins on this point was in the ninth century, in a French monastery on the Mount of Olives at Jerusalem. A Greek monk then openly accused the French monks of heresy for making this addition. The monks wrote to the Pope Leo III.; Leo wrote to the Emperor Charlemagne; the Emperor called a council at Aix-la-Chapelle to consider the matter. The Council referred to the Pope. The Pope decided that, while it is not necessary that every Article of the Faith should be inserted into the Creed, it is not lawful to add to

that composed at Nicæa and Constantinople; still the doctrine of the Procession of the HOLY SPIRIT from the FATHER and the SON is so far a matter of faith, that all those who are instructed in it are bound to a belief in it under pain of damnation; but it would be far better not to sing the Creed at the Mass, than to sing it with the addition under pretext of instructing the people in that mystery which can be explained in another manner. In the face of this, the *Filioque* was still retained in Spain, France, and Germany, till at last it established itself at Rome. When the final separation took place between East and West, it is easy to see how each side would defend its position and magnify its importance. Controversy is like a thick mist—it magnifies mole-hills into mountains. Had the like respect been paid to the letter of the Pope in the ninth century, under the Emperor Charlemagne, as there is in the nineteenth under the Emperor Napoleon, the obnoxious addition would not now have been a source of dispute between East and West.

It is also equally probable, that the doctrine would not have been a subject of dispute, for there is really very little difference in the teaching of the East and West, as expressed in their formularies; the presence of the *Filioque* is the cause of a seeming difference in doctrine. It is worthy of note that though three General Councils were held after the Council of Toledo, and before the separation of the West from the East, no objection was taken at any of them to the addition of the *Filioque*.

The doctrinal objection of the East is, that the presence of the *Filioque* implies the belief in two original sources, from whence proceeded the HOLY SPIRIT. This point was fully discussed at the Council of Florence, when the following statements were made by either party.* The Latins wrote: "That in saying that the HOLY SPIRIT proceeds from the FATHER and the SON, it is not in any way meant that there are two principles, or two causes of procession; on the contrary, it asserts one sole principle, and one sole cause of procession; and they, the Latins, anathematize those who say or who believe contrary to that doctrine." The Latins having thus explained their belief on this point, the Greeks expressed theirs. They said: "Since the Latins declared that the FATHER is the sole principle of the SON, and of the HOLY SPIRIT, and that they request us to express our faith also, we say that we declare as they do, that the FATHER is the sole principle of the SON and of the HOLY SPIRIT, Who proceeds from the FATHER and the SON, conformably to the writings of the Fathers." Nothing can be more satisfactory than this; here is at once common ground for all to take who wish to come to terms. We are able

to add to this, that one of the most learned of our divines, on a late occasion, explained that the Anglican formularies were never intended to assert two principles or causes. Thus, as far as the doctrine is concerned, the three branches of the Church are at one; if the *Filioque* were removed from the Creed, we should probably hear nothing of the difference in doctrine. It is true that the decrees of the Council of Florence were solemnly condemned by a Council of the Œcumenical Patriarchs of the East, held at Constantinople, and by a Council of Bishops held in Russia; but if we carefully examine the history of these times, we shall see that it was not the explanations which the Easterns had made concerning the doctrine of the Procession, that excited the indignation of the East, but their admission of the Papal Supremacy. Had the clause in the Creed been expressed "by the SON," instead of "and the SON," it is probable that there would have been no dispute about the *doctrine*, for the expression is found more than once in the Greek offices. Thus, there is sung at vespers on Tuesday in Whitsun week, "To-day, O LORD, descended the power of Thine All-holy SPIRIT," &c.; "To-day, O LORD, was sent forth from the FATHER, Thine Almighty SPIRIT," &c. On the Thursday, "The HOLY GHOST, of the same nature, and on the same throne with the FATHER and the WORD, is acknowledged to be GOD; All perfect Light, shining out of Light, proceeding from the eternal perfect FATHER, and by the SON" (*καὶ δι' Υἱοῦ*). These examples are sufficient to show that there is no divergence between the doctrine as stated by the Westerns at the Council of Florence, and the Easterns; the real cause of all the hostility is the presence of the *Filioque* in the Constantinopolitan Creed.

We have dwelt particularly on this point, for it is really *the* question between ourselves and our Eastern brethren; and because we feel strongly that if our divines would clear up this matter—is it too much to ask Convocation to sanction some such explanation?—a very great advance in the direction of re-union would be made.

This is no new proposal—there is actually a precedent for it, though in a quarter we should least expect to find it; but its presence there proves that divines have before this seen occasion to provide for the difficulty. In 1689, the Commissioners appointed by King William III., appended this note to the Nicene Creed, among their other suggestions: "It is humbly submitted to the Convocation, whether a note ought not to be here added with relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion." This proves that intercommunion with

the East was a subject of consideration with English ecclesiastics, even before the conferences entered into with Russia under Peter the Great. Another point we would urge upon Anglicans, equally necessary to union; and that is, to abstain from calling themselves and the Church Protestant. It may be considered rather late in the history of the Catholic revival to offer such advice; but there is more need for the warning than at first sight is apparent. The word has certainly never been authorized by the Church in any of her formularies; and can only be regarded by Catholics as a very unpleasant nickname, and one which not only causes offence to our brethren, but actually alienates them from us: and it is quite time that it was disused. It is exactly that which S. Paul specifies as a thing to be abjured, if "it make a weak brother to offend;" which it most certainly does. We have, moreover, authority for disusing and avoiding the term, not only because it has never been sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, but because it has been actually repudiated by the Lower House of Convocation in the year 1689, when the word Protestant was struck out of an address to the King.

There are, no doubt, other matters of difference between ourselves and the East, which would have to be considered, *e. g.*, the number of the Sacraments; the absence of the invocation and oblation in the Consecration of the Holy Eucharist; and the Gregorian Kalendar, especially as regards the keeping of Easter. These are probably the most important. Of the number of the Sacraments, it is a common notion, that the Anglican branch of the Church holds that the number is limited absolutely to two, while both the Greek and Roman maintain that there are seven. It is, however, a mistake to suppose we hold that there are two *only, i. e.*, excluding all other rites from being Sacraments. All that the Catechism says is, that there are "two only," "ordained of CHRIST," "as generally (*i. e.*, universally) necessary to salvation;" not excluding others, which are not absolutely necessary for all men. This agrees with the language of the Church in other places. In Article XXV. we read, "There are two Sacraments ordained of CHRIST *in the Gospel;* . . . the five commonly called Sacraments . . . are not to be counted for *Sacraments of the Gospel,*" not of the like necessity as the two great ones. This accords also with the language of the Homily "on Common Prayer and Sacraments." "And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for the visible sign, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sins, and of our holiness and

joining in CHRIST, there are but two; namely, Baptism and the Supper of the LORD. . . . Therefore neither it [Orders] nor *any other Sacrament else*, be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are." So also in the Act of Uniformity we have it enacted that ministers "be bounden to say and use the Matins, Evensong, Celebration of the LORD'S Supper, *and* Administration of *each of the Sacraments*;" and further on they are forbidden "to use any other Rite, Ceremony, Order, Form, or Manner of celebrating of the LORD'S Supper openly or privily, or Matins, Evensong, Administration of the *Sacraments* . . . than is mentioned and set forth in the said Book," &c.; where, in both cases, the word *Sacraments* is in the plural, though one of the two great Sacraments has been mentioned, clearly including Orders, Confirmation, &c., in the term. The writer of this essay may be allowed to state that when he was in Constantinople, some ten years ago, one of the Archimandrites at the palace of the Patriarch objected to the Anglican Catechism on this very ground, as denying the other five to be Sacraments. The writer gave the above explanation, that the words were not strictly exclusive, but only that they stated that these two alone were generally necessary to salvation. The Archimandrite assented, and said that such was the doctrine of the Oriental Church.

The absence of the Invocation in most of the Western Liturgies is in itself an almost unaccountable fact, and presents a very great difficulty to the Oriental Catholic. Happily there is one Liturgy in constant use in the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church—the Scottish—which retains it; there is also a less perfect form in the American. When the day of intercommunion arrives, these two Liturgies will no doubt form a most important link in re-uniting the broken chain of communion between the extreme East and the extreme West.

The question of the use of the Reformed Kalendar is a very serious one, since it throws out of order all Festivals, movable and immovable. When the writer was at Constantinople in 1857, those of the Western Rite were keeping Easter in, what was to those of the Eastern Rite, the middle of Lent. In Russia the civil Kalendar, as well as the Ecclesiastical, is unreformed, the difference being eleven days. Curiously enough, a Paschal controversy as to the proper day on which to keep Easter, was carried on between the Roman ecclesiastics and those of Ephesus as early as the second century; though the ground of the dispute is different. It occasioned the visit of S. Polycarp to Rome; but even that did not produce uniformity of practice, nor was the dispute settled until the Council of Nicæa. Whether

our Eastern brethren will, like S. Polycarp and Anicetus, agree to differ on this point; or whether they will submit to a council, and reform their Kalendar, we shall not pretend to speculate. We can only express a hope that this matter will not absolutely hinder the great question of intercommunion between ourselves and the East.

Passing from the Church in the East to the Church in the West, we find the difficulties of re-union increase: the quarrel has been fiercer, the animosity bitterer, and therefore the breach more irreparable. For upwards of three hundred years has the strife gone on, until each side has so misrepresented the other, that they mutually appear as monsters of iniquity; one calling the other Antichrist, and the other retorting by calling the first heretic and schismatic. It seems never to have occurred to either to inquire into the points of agreement. The Protestant denounced every thing that was Roman, *because* it was Roman; the Roman denounced every thing Protestant *because* it was Protestant. There is, however, a characteristic habit among Englishmen, after a battle well fought on both sides, to make friends with the antagonist, nay, even to take his part against former associates. This has been singularly the case in the Roman controversy. When, some twenty or thirty years ago, the Oxford Tracts induced men to take a different view of their position as members of the Church, the reaction was extraordinary. Men became suddenly enamoured of Rome, who before had been educated in the narrowest school of Protestantism; for it is a well-known fact, that most of the "converts" had been brought up as "Low Churchmen." The fact is not difficult to explain. They discovered that they had misunderstood and misrepresented Rome, and therefore naturally felt that they owed some amends for previous faults. Moreover, they felt a large amount of indignation against "Protestant" authorities for having so long deceived them; and they were quite ready to do battle for their new friend against their old ones. A far larger number took a wholly different line of conduct—they remained where they were, and used their better knowledge to remove old prejudices.

One whom English Catholics love to honour, whose poetry did more in gloomier times to instil true Church principles than many a larger tome, wrote thus, even when "Protestant" principles were wholly in the ascendant:—

> "Speak gently of our sister's fall:
> Who knows but gentle love
> May win her, at our patient call,
> The surer way to prove?"—*The Christian Year.*

This was written long before Tract 90 appeared; but it spoke a like sentiment. Those who are old enough, can well remember the feeling that ran through the country when that Tract appeared—the fierce indignation of some, and the blank dismay of those who had followed the writer so far, but found this too much for them. We need only recall to mind the intense interest that centred in Oxford, connected with the names of Ward, Oakeley, and MacMullen, in order to bring out clearly the fact of the mighty change that has passed over the religious mind of England since then. Not much more than twenty years after the condemnation of Tract 90, one of the writers of that series publishes his *Eirenicon*, advocating the very same principles which were so fiercely assailed in the former work. The book is quietly received, calmly read, impartially criticized in all the leading journals and reviews. Of course, there is a cry against it in some quarters. But this cry is not responded to generally; and only manifests more clearly the marvellous change that has taken place in English religious thought and character.

And this change of feeling is not confined to members of the Anglican body; it extends to those also of the Roman. The mere existence of such an association as that for the Re-union of Christendom, numbering among its members upwards of 1270 Roman Catholics, is a sufficiently remarkable phenomenon of itself. Still more remarkable is the fact, that this association appeared so formidable in the eyes of the Ultramontanes, that they obtained a Papal Rescript against it; yet so strong are its principles, and so earnest the desire for re-union, that only, comparatively, a few left it in obedience to the Papal order; and since the order, others have dared to join it. We read in the Report of the Association that, "the Holy Eucharist was celebrated by many on the seventh anniversary. Archbishops, bishops, religious and secular clergy, all joined in the work, with thanksgiving for the past, and with prayers and hopes for the future. In England, Scotland, and Ireland, the Holy Sacrifice was offered for its intention. In France, Austria, Prussia, Denmark, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, Malta, North and South America, and South Africa, members met together for a like holy purpose." No one, twenty years ago, would have believed that such a state of things could have existed; no such body as the Association could then have gathered together. It proves that Anglicans and Roman Catholics are engaged in considering the points of agreement, rather than those of difference; and are exorcising the demon of controversy to make way for the dove of

peace. While this process goes on, we have every hope of the future.

We are, however, met with the objection:—As long as the Anglican body retains its XXXIX Articles, its penal laws against Roman Catholics; and as long as Rome maintains its claim of Papal Supremacy, its Creed of Pope Pius, its dogma of the Immaculate Conception, so long is re-union impossible: in other words—As long as Rome remains as it is, and England remains as it is, re-union is impossible. This is a truism, but we may fairly question the premisses. The facts stated above show that there is an incredible change in the religious mind of England within this last twenty-five years. What may it not be in the next quarter of a century? A like change, perhaps not so extensive, is taking place among Roman Catholics, which even a Papal Rescript cannot check. What may not happen in the same period? Let us then more closely examine our relative positions.

First with respect to penal and other statutes. We have been informed on very high authority, that these statutes are by no means directed against the Roman Catholic *religion*, but only against the Court of Rome *politically*—against the assumed power of Rome to interfere with subjects under the dominion of the Queen of England. Let any one look at the last Act of Parliament on this subject, the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill," and he will see that the Act was not directed against the Roman Catholic Faith, but against the assumed power of the Pope to found Episcopal Sees in this country: its intention was to protect the Royal authority from invasion. And this, also, is throughout the sense to be attached to the unfortunate word "Protestant," which so often occurs in Acts of Parliament. It is employed solely in the sense of "not-Roman." It does not connote any religious belief, any particular creed, or form of Church government. It only means that which does not acknowledge the Papal political Supremacy.

Thus we are informed, on the same authority as before, that when the Act of Settlement restricts the marriage of any member of the Royal Family to a "Protestant," it does not exclude a Prince or Princess professing the faith of the Church in the East. In the eye of the law, a Russian Prince or Princess is equally a "Protestant," with a Danish or a Prussian. This fact will also apply to a considerable part of the XXXIX Articles—they are political, as well as religious. We must carefully distinguish, as the Gallican divines did, between the *Church* in Rome and the *Court* in Rome.

The objection, that Rome is unchangeable, and that, conse-

quently, we can never expect any communion with her, has more of sound in it than of fact. Rome is *not* unchangeable; on the contrary, she adapts herself to circumstances. Thus, she allows the Uniate Greeks to follow their own traditions, even when these traditions are diverse from her own. She allows them to use their own language in their Offices; she allows marriage in the Priesthood, Communion in both Kinds, and the use of the unreformed Kalendar. If she consents to such diversities in the case of the Greeks, may she not allow them in the case of others also? We may remark, in regard to another point, that she not only dispenses with the tonsure in their case, but also, in certain instances, in the case of her own priests. Thus, in Algier, both the Bishop and his priests are adorned with that ornament of nature, the beard. Further still, since the French Revolution, very considerable modifications have been sanctioned in compliance with the will of different nations. In France and Spain ecclesiastical property has been confiscated by the State, religious houses suppressed, and the religious themselves turned adrift. In both countries, ecclesiastics are stipendiaries of the Government; in the former their revenues are shared by Protestant ministers, and Jewish Rabbis. A solemn concordat between the Court of Rome and the Courts of these countries has sanctioned the arrangement. This is such a change as has never been even attempted by the Government of England. But even this is not all; the ecclesiastical state of Italy itself is, at this present moment, most anomalous. The King is excommunicated by the Pope, yet he receives the Sacraments of the Catholic Church. Archbishops and bishops, to say nothing of canons and parish priests, acknowledge him as King, whom the Pope has renounced: and all this by those in authority in what is called the Catholic Church. The case may be anomalous, but it is a fact. How it will end, we do not care to predict. One thing is, however, clear—that Rome is not what it once was, nor is the belief in the Papal Supremacy what that supremacy expects from the faithful.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that this state of things continues to go on in Italy, as it has begun; and that the desire of her first statesman is realized—a free Church in a free State. Suppose further—which does not appear to be very improbable—that the Church in Italy were to turn her eyes towards England, and model her Reformation after the pattern of ours, eliminating, of course, the Jesuitical element. And suppose that the temporal power of the Pope were abolished, and his dominions swallowed up in the Italian Kingdom; is it so very improbable that a concordat should be entered into between the Patriarch of Rome

—now denuded of his temporal Court—and the Church in Italy? Is it not probable that such an event would take place? If the Church in Italy had acknowledged the Church in England, the concordat with the Church in Italy would involve recognition, at least, of the Church in England. No one of us can affirm certainly what is in the womb of the future; but we all can prepare for eventualities which human foresight suggests. Never, certainly, have external events combined to render possible such a re-union, or, at least, to clear the way for recognition. There remains the more important and difficult question of doctrine.

First of all come the XXXIX Articles, those Protestant Articles tacked on to a Catholic Liturgy, those forty-stripes-save-one, as some have called them, laid on the back of the Anglican priesthood:—How are they to be got over? Are not they the standing protest against every thing Roman? Doubtless we have been so taught, and most of us so believe: for Catholic teaching in regard to the Articles has not been the rule in our Universities and Theological Colleges, much less in our popular expositions of the Articles; and it is the Protestant side that has received the greatest attention. Many of our readers, therefore, will be surprised to learn that Sancta Clara, in his Treatise on the Articles on the Roman side, appends the simple declaration of "This Article is Catholic throughout," or some such equivalent, to seventeen—nearly one-half of the thirty-nine. Still less will they expect to hear that in this number is included one which they have always been accustomed to be taught to regard as the most Calvinistic—the seventeenth. Very considerable portions of many of the others are also pronounced to be in accordance with Catholic teaching; exception being taken at some one or more particular statements.

Let us examine the position more exactly. Some diligent writer of the seventeenth century calculates that there are about 670 distinct propositions enunciated in the Articles; of these only 150 are positive, the rest, 520, are merely negative. No one can suppose that all these 670 are *de fide;* and that every priest when he reads over the Articles in his undertaking a parochial cure, or every graduate of the Universities, asserts his absolute belief in each and every of these 670 propositions. For instance, in Article XXXVII. there occurs this statement:—"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England." This proposition, as it stands nakedly, is not true in fact; it cannot, therefore, be *de fide.* The truth is, the Articles are not, and never were intended by their compilers to be, strictly, "Articles of Faith." They are Articles of Religion, and were drawn up,

as were the Books of the Homilies, for a special purpose, at a particular crisis, to meet a peculiar emergency. "The second Book of Homilies . . . doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, . . . therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers," &c. These words are from Article XXXV. They really explain the whole purpose and intention of both Articles and Homilies—they contain generally "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for *these times*," *i. e.*, for the sixteenth century. Would any Bishop, and would the Privy Council itself, deprive any priest of his preferment for denying that the Homilies were necessary for the times of the nineteenth century, and should be "read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly" every Sunday?

Further; not only has the whole order of things so changed between the sixteenth and the nineteenth century in the circumstances of the Church in England, but there has been also such a change in the Roman, at the Council of Trent, that many of the statements in the Articles, apparently condemning Roman doctrine, have reference to a popular belief long since passed away—they condemn certain popular views, which the Council of Trent also repudiated. For instance, Article XXXI. condemns a popular belief about the "Sacrifices of Masses:" "*Missarum Sacrificia*, quibus vulgo dicebatur," &c.; not *Missæ Sacrificium*—the Sacrifice of the Mass. On this Sancta Clara, who wrote after the Council, says: "In the latter part, if it be understood fitly, nothing is said against the Sacrifice of the Mass in itself, but against the vulgar and commonly-received opinion about it, namely, that priests in the Sacrifices offer CHRIST for the living and the dead, for the remission of pain and guilt, so that by virtue of this Sacrifice offered by them, independently of the Sacrifice of the Cross, they gain remission for the people," &c. Such a proposition is condemned equally by Rome as it is by us. So also, in Article XIII., the distinctions of the "school-authors"—*ut multi vocant*, popular error—about "grace of congruity," is obsolete, except as an abstract proposition.

The above instances are sufficient to show, that before we assume the XXXIX Articles to be a complete Protestant barrier against Rome, a process of elimination must be brought to bear upon them, which will very much modify the wholesale character of the assertion. We do not in the least deny, that many of the Articles were directly aimed against Rome, and condemn many popular Roman doctrines and practices still extant; but we do assert that they are not, taken as a whole, what Protestant writers would make them to be. The historical position is really this.

There existed in the Anglican Communion, up to the middle of the sixteenth century, a large amount of corruption in doctrine, and still more in practice, which it became necessary to reform. At that period, the Church had departed not only from the primitive standard, but also from the national standard of faith and discipline. In reducing the nation to a conformity with ancient principles, the Ecclesiastical authorities found it convenient to draw up certain authoritative declarations of what was the primitive faith on such points, and to condemn what was erroneous. This was done in the XXXIX Articles. There were also added certain discourses on these points, appointed to be read in churches by priests who, for want of learning and ability, were unable to compose such themselves, explaining, in a popular manner, what these errors were, and what was the truth. There was not the slightest intention to draw up standards of faith for the whole Catholic Church, nor to attempt to impose the decrees of the Synod of London on other branches of the Church, or to elevate these decrees into the position of a Creed. It was purely a national matter, considered necessary for a particular state of things then existing.

This is more plainly seen when we remember that assent to these Articles is not required of the laity, but only of those who undertake ecclesiastical offices. They are then required to renounce certain matters of religion previously held and practised, because the ecclesiastical authorities had declared them to be erroneous; and to give their assent to certain theological propositions which had been formerly obscured, or perhaps denied. The Articles are consequently not Articles of Faith, but Articles of Religion, "for the avoiding of diversities of opinion, and for establishing of consent touching true Religion." This is the more evident when we consider that of the 670 propositions contained in the Articles, 520 are negative, and 150 only are positive. Three and a half negative assertions to one positive, is not exactly the form of a body of Articles of Faith; and certainly very different from the custom of Creeds. It is not directly, but only indirectly, that the Western Church, outside of England, is in any way even alluded to, much less condemned, by the Articles; for instance, the supremacy of the Pope over communities which form the Western Church is nowhere condemned or disputed, but only a political jurisdiction over the realm of England. The Articles therefore do not lay it down as a matter of faith to deny the supremacy in the abstract; but only, in a constitutional point of view, to assert that the Pope has no jurisdiction by divine right over the Church in England, or over

the realm of England. It is only the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—no great authority in the eyes of an English ecclesiastic—which has sought to elevate the Articles of Religion into Articles of Faith.

There is another feature in the language of the Articles which deserves especial attention, viz., its general character, as opposed to positive and definite; an unwillingness, on the part of the compilers, to dogmatize unnecessarily. Thus, Article XVII. concludes in these words:—"Furthermore, we must receive GOD'S promises in such wise, as they are generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and, in all our doings, that Will of GOD is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of GOD." A still more remarkable instance occurs in Article XI., the latter part of which stands thus:—"Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." Not only are these terms extremely general, but there is actually an uncertainty as to what Homily we are referred to; and this is the more striking, inasmuch as the more particular language of the Articles of 1552 is purposely departed from. Dr. Hey, in his lectures, published, let it be noted, at the Pitt Press, Cambridge, says:—"This is a part of our Article which seems to afford us liberty, when it is compared with the Article of 1552. In that men were required to profess the doctrine of Justification, *in that sense* as it is declared in the 'Homily of Justification.' So that the whole *Homily* became an *Article*. By the present form we are only called upon to declare, that the Homily expresses the doctrine more *fully* than the Article; which we might declare, even though we thought that the Homily contained some things which we did not approve." Dr. Hey then goes on to inquire which is the Homily intended; and he concludes that not one Homily, but four, are intended, viz., those of Human Misery, Salvation, Faith, and Good Works: and he adds this very important piece of information, that "Ridley, in his life of Bishop Ridley, says that our Church referred to the Homily, lest the short expressions of the Article should occasion their being thought *Lutherans*, in saying we are justified by only faith." Surely there is reason in saying that the XXXIX Articles were very far from being intended to be Articles of Faith.

It is generally understood that there are four points in the Roman system, which were especially repudiated at the Reformation, and protested against by the Anglican branch of the Church. These four points are, Papal Infallibility, Papal Supre-

macy, the Doctrine of Purgatory, and the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the latter, of course, including the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception. All these, excepting the last, we should naturally expect to find explicitly mentioned and condemned in the Articles; and had the Articles been, as they are usually represented to be, standards of Protestantism, they would have been so; or rather, we should say, unless they are found there condemned and repudiated, the XXXIX Articles cannot be esteemed as intrinsically Protestant. Let us see what they say.

Of the *doctrine* of Infallibility, or of the Supremacy of the Pope, not a word is said: the only statements bearing on the subject are those in the XIXth and XXXVIIth Articles. The first merely states that certain branches of the Church have erred, among them the Church of Rome. Roman Catholics do not deny that Liberius and Honorius, though Bishops of Rome, did err in matters of faith. The XXXVIIth Article states nothing of the *doctrine* of the Supremacy; it is essentially political, and declares that in the matter of *jurisdiction* the Pope has no right to interfere with the ecclesiastical status of the Church in England. The condemnation of the popular doctrines of Purgatory, and the *cultus* of S. Mary, included in the "Invocation of Saints," is certainly very mild, and is different from the language usually held by Protestant controversialists on these points; the doctrine is "a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of GOD." That is all. It may mean a great deal, or it may mean very little. All we say is, that it is not the way that persons would write who intended to draw up a Protestant declaration against Roman doctrine. If it is lawful to spoil the enemy, and turn his weapon against himself, we might, when speaking of Purgatory, appeal to the late judgment of the Privy Council in the matter of the *Essays and Reviews*, when it was held lawful to maintain the doctrine that all future punishment is correctional and terminable—a position certainly, in some form or other, implying the doctrine of Purgatory.

In the matter of Transubstantiation, the real point at issue is not the doctrine of the Real Presence, on which both sides are agreed, but only as to the mode of the Presence. The Mediæval doctrine, there condemned, is a certain scholastic definition of substance, as propounded by Aristotle, and elaborated by the Schoolmen; namely, that there is a *substratum* underlying the accidents, but independent of them, and that this *substratum* is the substance that is changed at consecration. The question, thus depending on a subtle distinction, which may, or may not be a

fact, is rather one for the philosopher than the theologian, and will best be understood from an examination of the writings of John Locke and Bishop Berkeley, the former of whom asserted, while the latter denied, the existence of this *substratum*. What the Anglican divines condemned in the Article is, the gross and carnal notions current in the sixteenth century; notions which were very considerably rectified by the Council of Trent; and which are equally condemned by modern Roman Catholics, as will be seen from the Treatise of Sancta Clara. The same gross and carnal notion is also condemned in Article XXIX., where the wicked, who "carnally and visibly press with their teeth" the Sacramentum, are declared to be in no ways partakers of the spiritual benefits of the Sacrament. These two Articles are directed against certain doctrines generally current in England up to the middle of the sixteenth century, like others respecting grace, which we mentioned above.

Let us not be mistaken. We are not advocating or extenuating popular "Roman" doctrine. We are not trying to persuade our readers that the points of difference between such doctrine and ourselves are few and unimportant. All that we are doing is to examine what are popularly considered as the Standard of Faith in the Anglican branch of the Church—the specialities, so to speak, of our isolated position with regard to the rest of the Catholic Church—and to show how little ground there is *in them* for the charge identifying us with popular Protestantism. We have endeavoured to place ourselves and our readers on ground, *pro hâc vice*, outside of both parties, and to inquire impartially how far Anglican formularies, in their strict grammatical meaning, repudiate certain doctrines held to be specialities of Rome, and erroneous. We have been most particular in drawing a distinction between the formularies which Anglican priests subscribe, and popular notions of what Anglicanism is.

We come lastly to that which is, without any doubt, the great difference between the two Communions of Rome and England; the seemingly impassable barrier that hinders intercommunion between the two: we mean, of course, the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The gulf, wide enough before, is immensely increased by the elevation of what was only a "pious opinion," into an Article of the Faith—the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. We must ask ourselves—Is it possible to effect intercommunion with a branch of the Church which holds this doctrine, together with its natural and legitimate consequences, the especial *cultus* which accompanies it? It is certainly difficult to give any other answer than an emphatic, No! Then,

further, the endeavour of a certain party in that Communion to give divine honour to the Mother of our LORD; the openly expressed purpose to inaugurate an "Age of Mary," is simply shocking and abhorrent to the mind of English Catholics, and seems to forbid any *rapprochement*. This is true, but we must not judge too hastily. We must deal with written documents, not with the extravagances of a party. We should consider that an opponent would be acting very unfairly were he to identify the principles of Anglicanism with the fanaticism of an Irish "Protestant," even though the latter is in communion with the Church in England. So we must not identify the Latin Church with the extravagances of the Oratorians, most of whom are "converts" from Anglicanism, and are looked on with great suspicion by "old English Roman Catholics." But, then, the decree of the Immaculate Conception—is not this published by the Pope, after consulting with the whole Episcopate in the Roman Communion? Here, at least, we have not only unanimity of opinion, but a formal expression by the mouth of the Episcopate, and of its head the Pope. This is more apparent than real. A large proportion of the bishops consulted gave no opinion at all; others simply left the matter in the hands of the Pope; others expressed their dissent. Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon* has laboriously collected evidence on this subject, and given the results. We can only refer our readers to his work, many of whom, we are sure, have been, or will be, surprised at learning the facts there disclosed. Some bishops were influenced to give their adhesion from motives of expediency, some from unwillingness to oppose the desire of the Pope; this is not real unanimity.

It is here that we see ground for hope. In the very extravagance of those who are trying to push on the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary towards accomplishing an "Age of Mary," we see grounds for anticipating a reaction. It was the abuse of the doctrine of Indulgences that caused the reaction against the Pope in the sixteenth century. It may be reaction against the excessive *cultus* of S. Mary that will bring on a second Reformation—not, this time, a Protestant one, but a Catholic. If only English Catholics are true to their principles, and if only they take care to manifest before the world that the Anglican branch of the Church is in all essential points Catholic, they may make her the instrument of effecting the two greatest desiderata of the present age—Re-union and Reformation. Already has she done something towards this in the case of a portion of the Eastern branch. The Archbishop of Belgrade has admitted English priests to communion. Already are there

many eyes of Italian Catholics looking towards England. Already have many French Catholics learned to distinguish between English Churchmen and English Protestants. May we not hope that there is a great and noble mission for us, to manifest what are the true principles of Catholic Reformation; and, in so doing, to hold out the right hand of fellowship to all true Catholics both of East and West?

We are not to suppose that the idea of re-union between the English and Roman branches of the Church is a new one, a dream of some enthusiasts of the nineteenth century. Twice before, at least, has the matter been seriously considered, once with considerable probability of success; but, like that with Russia, rendered abortive through political changes. The first was in the reign of Charles I., when a Monsignor Cerri was commissioned by Pope Innocent XI. to report to him on the religious state of England. This report was apparently first published in French, in the year 1701, and in 1715 translated and published in English, by Sir R. Steele. This translation is extremely scarce, and very little known. The mission of Monsignor Cerri must have been considered important at the time, as it is alluded to in some of the State papers. He reports that the King, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud), the Bishop of Chichester (Mountague), and seven other bishops, and several of the nobility, listened favourably to the proposals. On the Roman side negotiations were conducted by Signor Panzani, who had been commissioned by the Pope to visit England, and was accredited to the Roman Catholics there by a Papal brief. He was even empowered to promise a Cardinal's hat to certain of the bishops who were unmarried, in the event of the reconciliation being effected. The great difficulty lay in the Oath of Supremacy, which seemed to render impossible the recognition of the Pope by English ecclesiastic and civil officers. Throughout the whole, the view the writer takes is, that the quarrel was between the two *Courts* of England and Rome, not between the two *branches of the Church*; in other words, it was political and not religious, as the following extract will show:—"When England separated from the Church of Rome, it was not so much out of a desire for a Reformation, as out of revenge; Henry VIII. being highly displeased with the *Court of Rome* for refusing to approve his divorce. In the reign of his son Edward, the Reformation was settled with the public consent of the whole kingdom, for the reason just mentioned. The same kingdom was easily reconciled with the Church of Rome under the reign of Mary, as it had freely separated from it. When Queen Elizabeth came to

the Crown, it was her interest to favour the Reformation; and she found her people as willing to embrace it as they had been to reject it in the time of Mary. . . . But, as I have said, that Reformation having been made *by the Court* rather to shake off the Pope's authority, than out of love for new opinions, England was not so much attached to any particular opinions, but rather endeavoured to reform the abuses of religion by reducing it to the standard of primitive Christianity. This kingdom having obstinately continued to reject the Pope's authority, the Catholics, who, during the first twelve years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, complied with the ecclesiastical government established by that princess, began to withdraw from it, and being desirous to appear united to the Pope, refused to go to church, and so formed a party in the State." There were, however, two parties that strongly opposed such re-union, as Laud and Mountague frequently declared, "the Puritans among the Protestants, and the Jesuits among the Catholics." It was about this time that the latter, to thwart such negotiations, invented the "Nag's Head Fable."

Throughout the whole of this narrative, we do not find a trace of any doubt concerning the validity of English Orders. On the contrary, the writer contemplated a return of the Anglican community to communion with the Roman, in a manner similar to that which took place on the accession of Queen Mary. Those priests who were ordained during the reign of Edward VI. were not re-ordained—they were only reconciled, for no one disputed their Orders; so, had Monsignor Panzani's mission succeeded, the bishops and priests of Charles I.'s time would have been simply reconciled in like manner, not re-ordained.

The next attempt at re-union was that proposed by certain French ecclesiastics in the eighteenth century, well known to the readers of Mosheim's "History." There was, at that time, a common ground of sympathy between the Gallican and Anglican ecclesiastics; both had a quarrel with the Court of Rome. Archbishop Wake, who carried on the correspondence on the Anglican side, completely convinced his Gallican brethren of the validity of English Orders; and had not certain political events occurred, it is very possible that re-union would have been effected. A traditionary recollection of their friendly interchange of good-will lingered among French ecclesiastics even to our own day, and is happily reviving; the *Union Chrétienne* and the *Observateur Catholique* could not exist without native support.

When the Relief Bill of 1791 was passed, there were some who thought they saw an opening for renewing negotiations for re-

union. Bishop Barrington, in a Charge to the clergy of Durham, thus expressed himself:—"There appears to me to be, in the present circumstances of Europe, better grounds of hope for a successful issue to a dispassionate investigation of the differences which separate the two Churches of England and Rome, than at any former period. With this view and these hopes, I continue to exert my humble efforts in this great cause of charity and truth. . . . . And what public duty of greater magnitude can present itself to us than the restoration of peace and union to the Church, by the reconciliation of two so large portions of it as the Churches of England and Rome?" His friendly words were reciprocated by more than one of the Roman Catholic bishops.

There is a certain practical sense in Englishmen, which, on all questions, is disposed to ask, "*Cui bono?*" "Where is the use of re-union? We get on very well as we are." It is not a sufficient answer to such, to take the high spiritual and scriptural ground: we must take a lower one. It is this: Englishmen are dispersed, singly, or in companies, over every country in the world—every foreign city has English households, every harbour English ships; but they have not an Anglican priest to minister to them. As long as this miserable state of disunion continues, they cannot obtain the Sacraments of the Church and the ministration of religion from native priests, without renouncing their own communion and their own religion, and accepting that of the foreigner. The result is, that there are thousands of unbaptized children in foreign lands; thousands live without the Sacraments and ministrations of the Church, and their friends have, at the last, to commit their bodies to the earth without any religious rite; or some Protestant minister—no one knows but he may be a teacher of some strange heresy—is called in to perform such rites, to the scorn of the surrounding Catholics. Were such a re-union as we are here pleading for established, Englishmen would go to the priest of the Eastern or Western branch of CHRIST'S Church alike, and ask for the Sacraments and ministrations of the Church, without having to renounce any thing of his own, without having to confess more than his belief in the One Catholic Faith.

Let us conclude this Essay with the more pleasing task of exhibiting the points of unity in the three branches of CHRIST'S Church.

First, then, we have one common episcopate and priesthood with the other two branches of the Catholic Church. The

Anglican and the Roman use the same form of words in ordination, with the like action—the laying on of hands. The Eastern differs from the Western in the use of a different mood only; in essence they are the same. Next, the Liturgies of all are of Apostolic origin; in each the Canon is the same. The Roman and the Anglican differ from the Eastern in not retaining the Invocation and the Oblation, but both these are retained in the Scottish and American, and so these two last form a link between East and West. The great Catholic revival of our day has brought all these branches nearer to each other, especially the two Western branches. Anglicans are reproached by Protestants with their resemblance to Romans; they say a stranger entering into a church where Ritual is carefully attended to, might easily mistake it for a Roman service. Of course he might; the whole purpose of the great revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period, and restore the glory of Catholic worship. Our churches are restored after the mediæval pattern, and our Ritual must accord with the Catholic standard. Our Book of Common Prayer is no Protestant invention. It is not the creation of the sixteenth century. The Eucharistic Office is only a variety of the Western rite. The Fast and Feast days are nearly the same; the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are nearly the same; the Altar and its ornaments are nearly the same; the habits and vestments of the priesthood are the same; the actions are the same; the plain song is the same. Is it any wonder that they may be mistaken? Take our matins and even-song—what are they but five of the ancient seven Offices compressed into two?—with these two differences, and we may well be proud of them—1. That they are primarily public, and not private, as is the use of the Roman; 2. That the whole Psalter, and not merely parts of it, is sung through publicly twelve times a year. Here again we see the same plain song, the same Canticles, the same order of the Books of Scripture. And in those churches where the Catholic revival obtains, the ancient tones for the Psalms are daily sung, as they were in the days of Gregory the Great; and the ancient metrical hymns are again resuming their place. And not only this, but the same round of Christian seasons, marked by their own appropriate colour, instructs the eye as well as the ear, and preaches CHRIST and His Redemption. Further, Ritual, like painting and architecture, is only the visible expression of divine truth. Without dogma, without an esoteric meaning, Ritual is an illusion and a delusion; a lay figure without life or spirit, a *vox et præterea nihil*. The experience of the last century shows that it is impossible to preserve the

Catholic Faith excepting by Catholic Ritual; the experience of the present century equally makes manifest the fact that the revival of the Catholic Faith must be accompanied by the revival of Catholic Ritual; and still more, that the surest way to teach the Catholic Faith is by Catholic Ritual.

We have purposely abstained in this Essay from considering the question of Re-union as implying absorption of Protestant Dissenters. But we may be permitted to make one allusion to the question before we close. What is it that is now drawing all the most earnest and most devout of the various Protestant bodies towards the Church, and leaving only the Political Dissenter behind, but the great Catholic Revival? What but the teaching of the Catholic Faith with and by Catholic Ritual? Contrast this with the work of the last century and the beginning of this; the great Evangelical movement, as it is called. Under that movement, and by means of it, thousands and tens of thousands of earnest and devout men renounced the Church and became schismatics; and we, at this present day, are reaping the harvest of tares which the enemy sowed, while the servants of the householder slept under the soporific influence of Protestant ascendency. But the experience of the last few years has shown that wherever the Catholic Faith is taught and Catholic Ritual restored, the first-fruits of the harvest are the children and grandchildren of those who renounced the Church for the Conventicle. Yes, the great Catholic Revival which is drawing Anglicans nearer and nearer to those of the two other branches of the One Body, is also daily acting as a loadstone to attract to the Body of CHRIST the individual particles that were disintegrated through the corroding influence of apathy and neglect.

EDWIN L. BLENKINSOPP.

The last Thirty Years in the English Church: an Autobiography.

THE history of change in the religious belief of countries has always been thought deeply interesting, even when it comes down to us as little more than a record of bare facts. Subjects on which all men think more or less, which involve their deepest emotions, and affect the highest part of their nature, and which are brought to bear alike on the daily life of each generation, must, of necessity, strongly interest all who look forward to another world after death. In old times few, comparatively, recorded the steps by which they were led to their final opinions, and those who have done so were persons in a prominent position, who took part in the events of the day, and whose lives therefore were far removed from the every-day men and women around them.

The revival of the Catholic Faith throughout Europe in the middle of the ninteenth century, will be a striking and interesting feature in the history of the Universal Church, as long as the world lasts; and the silent revolution that has taken place in men's minds in England, is likely to be not the least interesting or important part of it. The way in which it has affected obscure individuals, and those who to all human sight were removed from its influence, has been noticed from the first as one of its singular features, marking the presence of some objective and spiritual agency. In quiet and retired country villages, young people were pondering over the same subjects, and feeling the same difficulties, which at the same time were occupying the attention of practical theologians in Oxford and London, and were instinctively finding out for themselves the value of ascetic practices long esteemed in the Church, but which no one had ever mentioned to them. A longing for some religion greater and higher than the teaching of their childhood stirred the hearts of many who were unconscious where these desires were tending. Books and events of the day swayed and strengthened, but seldom originated, the change of thought all over the country, which we now call the Catholic revival.

Forces, though apparently opposing, helped it on; the very Evangelicals themselves were its earlier, though unconscious, promoters, and secessions to Rome, which were supposed at the time to be almost fatal checks, also, as we see now, gave the movement a helping hand; while from them a curious reactive current of thought is setting in, which is likely to spread Catholic principles with tenfold force, before it has exhausted itself. It is noteworthy, although just what might have been antecedently expected, that the earlier Evangelical movement was far more Catholic in its character than it afterwards became. Asceticism and self-discipline were its essential features. Severe fasting, watching, and bodily mortifications were practised by Wesley, Fletcher, and those whom they influenced, to an extent which few Catholics have as yet attained. Cecil had some strong ideas also on the value of mortification and voluntary celibacy, which his present admirers, or those who fancy themselves such, condemn as weaknesses. He it was who advocated always choosing the food which you least preferred, while the editors of Henry Martyn's Diary found it as well to suppress the fact that he at times mortified his flesh by walking about with stones in his shoes. Like many other defectively taught but excellent men, their practice was better than their theory, and as they never gave asceticism its true position in their instructions to others, it was naturally not adopted by their successors.

That which was at first a logical inference from their teaching, has latterly become a received statement; namely, that the attainment of salvation is the easiest thing conceivable. You had only to accept the offer of pardon freely held out to you, and it would matter nothing in the day of judgment whether your sins were many or few—heinous crimes, or only sins of infirmity. Self-examination was not in so many words condemned, but repentance for individual sins was practically discouraged, and the soul instructed to be contented with feeling itself generally sinful and worthless. The whole unhappy theory of "imputed righteousness," founded on ignorance of the truth that through our union with our LORD His righteousness is imparted to us, and that our works are His and not ours, still further confirmed many in a belief that holiness, though desirable as a proof of the reality of faith, was not necessary for salvation. Young people were educated to believe that the renunciation of certain pleasures denominated worldly, and the presence in their hearts of certain feelings of their own unworthiness, and trust in the righteousness of their SAVIOUR, were to be the leading characteristics, external and internal, of their religion. Until these were apparent to

themselves, they were taught to regard themselves and others as unconverted and unregenerate, and afterwards they received but little more instruction in the stern and unceasing warfare by which alone the whole body of sin can be destroyed. They were taught that all who did not exhibit these marks of true religion were more or less worldly, and they were exhorted to try and "do good" to such persons, even if older than themselves; and naturally, therefore, to regard themselves in a much higher state than those who were somewhat hastily classed as belonging to "the world" around them. It is difficult to speak truly, and yet with sufficient gentleness, of a system containing so much good and so much evil. Undoubtedly it was a great advance above the dry morality of the day; but it shut out much real unobtrusive piety by its arbitrary distinctions, and it fostered the self-conceit of young people, who were often far lower in the spiritual life than those whom they condemned. Many have led a life of patient self-sacrifice, and have passed unharmed through bitter temptation, without attaining to a high standard of excellence, or undergoing the visible change, which alone was considered to be "conversion." No Catholic would for an instant suppose that such persons were true types of the Christian character, but they were far above young and untried theorists, whose devotion and love were yet but a matter of words and feelings, who had never been proved to have any stability, and whose creed was in many important points self-constructed and heretical.

It is a grievous mistake, and a terrible danger to the soul, when devotional words or feelings, or, on the other hand, external practices, are allowed to outrun the subjugation of evil within. A child that talks, or even thinks, much of its affection to our LORD, and yet habitually tells lies, is in really a lower state than a child that does sturdily what it calls "right," with very little thought of what "right" means, and with very little interest in the theories on which "right" is founded. To know what ought to be done, and yet always to practise the contrary, either not thinking about it, or excusing it by a plea of weakness, and satisfying the conscience with the thought of the righteousness of One Who is believed to have been holy in our stead—is a state of mind widely prevalent, and one for which the successors of the earlier Evangelicals have much to answer. Happily, many do not comprehend the real meaning of the teaching they receive, and so are far better than their system. Yet it is found increasingly defective, even tested by their own standards. Personal religion declines among them, and a high standard of holiness can now only be found among Catholics—with perhaps a few exceptions,

belonging to a generation fast dying out, and leaving no successors. Thirty years ago, however, it was not so. Those who then were really earnest in subduing sin, in living a life above the world, and doing good to others, were almost certain to belong to what was called the Evangelical school. There existed beside them a few remnants of the older type, of which Bishop Wilson might be called the last distinguished instance; but they were sadly below his saintly standard, and the charge of formalism brought against them was not untrue, while even their freedom from heresy was far more negative than positive. They inherited a hatred of Papists and Dissenters which was chiefly political, and their standard scarcely went higher than the attainment of respectability, with the due performance of the social duties of life, a certain amount of specified devotional exercises, and in their inner life the subdual of what a Catholic would call mortal sin. But they had a great abhorrence of extremes, and generally thought the existing state of things, whether bad or good, was better left alone, and that the Evangelicals were suspicious persons, because they were by no means inclined to leave any thing alone. Energetic preaching, and the necessity of conversion, were dimly suggestive of the overthrow of Episcopacy and the cutting off of King Charles's head, just as, a few years later, crucifixes, confession, and ritual, indicated that society was becoming undermined by Jesuit machinations, and were closely connected with Guy Fawkes and burning people to death.

With these persons, although in the same communion, Evangelicals had far less sympathy than with Dissenters. As a matter of good order, they held by Episcopacy, but without believing in any supernatural power belonging to it. They saw that without Episcopacy, Protestant bodies fell into errors and heresies, and they perceived the good effects of an established body of dignified clergy as part of the theory of government. Supernatural grace, as tied to sacerdotal acts, they were inclined to repudiate; such acts might be, and were, blessed to the faithful soul, but there was no irreparable loss without them. Their belief in the Incarnation was practically and theoretically confined to the Atonement, which they only understood in one point of view, and regarded as a past act. Their belief in the change to be effected in human beings by Christianity was, that a Divine influence should transform the desires and affections, and regulate the will; Christians remaining the while simply human beings as they were born, only with a regenerated human nature as well as a corrupt one, eventuating hereafter in the entire destruction of the corrupt nature. The position of man

also was to be changed, and, from being under the wrath of GOD, he was to become an adopted and beloved child.

Personal love to an omnipresent Human SAVIOUR, and an avoidance of all pleasures and refinements of life calculated to blunt the feelings and desires which were their test of real piety —these were the objects they set before themselves. Preaching of the kind they advocated was found to stir up the soul better than any thing else they knew, and consequently they set great store by it. They were contented to hear over and over again the same statement of their lost condition and the mercy provided for them; and if that exercise resulted in what a Catholic would call acts of faith, contrition, and love, they felt that their souls had been benefited. They regarded the Sabbaths or Thursday evenings on which these blessings could be attained as seasons which ought to be greatly enjoyed; and in order that the soul might concentrate itself more on feelings and thoughts of the same nature, they believed that no others should be allowed to intrude on the day of rest. The mind that could not rise to the required condition, was worldly or heavy; and if in a healthy state, it could never get tired of what was believed to be its highest and noblest exercise. Consequently those who wished to be considered religious people, were obliged to acknowledge that this particular way of spending Sunday was delightful, because otherwise they were at once set down as worldly. Subjectivity was so essentially the characteristic of this creed, that any idea of holiness apart from action, thought, and feeling, had no place in its practical theology, and the mind was continually urged to look for religious states as final results, which a Catholic only regards as accidental accessories.

This is a rough sketch of the state of things among religious people as it impressed me when I was a child, thirty years ago, and as it appears to me now. My father was a priest of the Evangelical school, and for some time he was almost its only clerical adherent in our neighbourhood, which was surrounded by parishes where neglect and sloth reigned supreme. Our position as children was somewhat isolated. A few persons we understood to be really good people, and every body else, we thought, belonged to the wicked world, and we were not allowed to associate with such. Indulged in some respects, but with a few commands strictly enforced, we were, I think, unruly children, and there were grave evils among us never imagined by our parents. We grew up from early childhood without much self-control, with strong tempers and passions, without much courtesy or

knowledge of refined life, self-willed and impulsive, but devoted to intellectual pursuits—a clever family ourselves, and with a considerable amount of contempt for those who were not so. Yet in no small degree religion was a reality with us all. Thoughtless and careless though we were, and ignorant that many seriously wrong things were sinful, we never did what we knew to be wrong without real sorrow and resolutions of amendment, while GOD was really our Friend and Refuge in childish trouble, as well as One Whose forgiveness must be sought for sin. But the system in which we were all educated, as a distinctive system, never, I think, would have satisfied me when I once began to reason; for from my earliest childhood I was unconsciously feeling about for something practical. Of course I was taught to say that Sunday was the happiest day in the week; but I greatly preferred Monday, because it was furthest off from that oppressive day, and I disliked going to church as much as I disliked any thing. The theology put into our hands was unmitigatedly bad—irreverent and degrading in its language, and full of what I know now to be Nestorian heresy. There was a wretched little book (long since, I trust, out of print) attempting to describe the Passion of our LORD in language adapted to children, so degrading the subject, and permeating my mind with its ideas, that it is only within the last very few years that I have been able to get rid of the miserable associations it gave me. Such books as *The Children's Friend*, and, of course, all Mrs. Sherwood's publications, with various works denouncing Roman Catholic and Greek idolaters, I not only read, but studied in a way which, I am persuaded, is unusual among children now, with the greater variety of books and superficial habits permitted in the present day.

From a very early age I had a great desire to receive the Blessed Sacrament. I used sometimes voluntarily to stay through the "additional" service, and at home I used often to make acts of what I should now call Spiritual Communion, though, of course, I had never heard of the practice. I always had a strong desire to conquer what was amiss in me, and could not contentedly go on doing the same wrong things every day with no prospect of definite amendment. Once I remember attempting something like self-examination, and an enumeration of the faults committed in a day. But it was an attempt effectually silenced. I was told that it was an impossibility, that there was not a moment or an action of our lives that was not full of sin; and I remember thinking to myself—"If it is so, then there is not the least use in trying to mend or to alter, because it can't be done. I did think that I knew that I had committed seven or eight sins

to-day, but according to this there is *nothing* that is not wrong." So I abandoned that effort in despair.

I do not know whether it was before or after this that, from my peculiar corner in my father's study, I used to hear many vehement discussions about certain "Tracts." I was very familiar with tracts. A whole basketful used to be covered with brown paper and exchanged weekly in the village; but I was not fond of them, because they were dirty, and, except for the first page of story, very dull. But as I also thought (and perhaps justly) that there was not much in them, I was greatly surprised to hear all the clergy who came to see my father so very earnest, and sometimes so very angry, about these "Oxford Tracts," and I used to wonder much what they could be.

My father had at one time a pupil, considerably my senior, who became afterwards and who is still a distinguished leader of the Catholic revival. We hardly knew him from one of ourselves, and heard with deep interest and dismay that he was becoming infected with the new "Views," which I then learnt to connect with the Oxford Tracts and Dr. Pusey. There was much low-voiced speaking and sad condemnation going on, not, however, shared to any great degree by my father, from which I could at first only gather that there was a terrible Dr. Pusey, and a no less terrible Mr. Newman, putting forth sadly wicked things, and that my father's dear pupil, Arthur Willis, was departing from the teaching of his early days. I regarded him in consequence with a childish sort of awe, and when I actually saw with my own eyes a plain white cross upon his study mantelpiece, and some ghostly-looking rubbings of old brasses hanging against the walls, I hardly liked to go into the room. I verily believed that he worshipped the cross and said his prayers to it. But he was very quiet, wrote a great deal, and when he argued never provoked any body. Every one said he was very good, and as my father could appreciate goodness wherever he met with it, there was never the smallest diminution in their mutual affection.

My next experience was a different one. One of our own number plunged at once into a vehement and fierce partisanship of the Tracts and all things belonging. It did not present the Catholic faith in an attractive form. Home opposition became more confirmed; and we younger ones turned into childish and persecuting adherents of Protestant principles, and made ourselves as foolish as children might be expected to do under the circumstances, in a household where freedom of speech (to call it by no stronger word) was the rule. This was encouraged by

well-meaning but not over-wise friends. I well remember sitting on a clergyman's knee and abusing the Pope in terms for which I ought to have had my ears boxed, but which were thought rather amusing. Controversial subjects were the atmosphere of the household. It is almost necessarily so in a clergyman's family, if his opinion is valued, and his mind given to theology; and is, under the most favourable circumstances, an unfortunate training for children.

Three important events (to me) happened when I was about thirteen. I began to read these much-talked-of Tracts for myself, and was rather disappointed not to find in them the ghastly horrors I expected, from all the epithets I had heard bestowed on them. I heard my first choral service in Westminster Abbey, and discovered that it would be possible to like going to church if I might always go there; and we had a visit from some cousins rather older than ourselves, also under the influence of the Catholic revival, and conscientiously acting out what they knew. We had wonderful arguments, and I always got the worst of them. Moreover I began to discover that the superstitions and practices ascribed to Roman Catholics and Puseyites were not invariably true. I remember hearing a lady, with much emphasis and many head-shakings, telling my mother that one of the Tractarian leaders was a most cruel man in his own family. If any of his children were naughty, he made them stand up against the wall of his room all night, and got out of bed every now and then to be sure that they were awake. I believed this legend for a long time, and experienced afterwards the usual reaction caused by trash of this sort. I had heard of "prayers for the dead" also, and imagined that they were much like those of the South Sea Islanders for the supply of bodily wants after death, and I was much impressed when one of the ancient supplications for the departed was first shown me. I incorporated it into my prayers thenceforth. It was somewhere about that time, too, that I first met with, and was startled by, the expression—"GOD died for man," and I perceived that up to that time I had never really believed in our LORD'S Divinity at all. For many years after this, the use of His adorable Name without some title of reverence, was intolerable to me; and I believe the same feeling accounted for the reserve with which He was mentioned in sermons and devotions during the early days of the movement, and which of late years has been happily abandoned.

The melting away of unfounded early prejudice was gradual; but I believe my confirmation at the age of fourteen, little as I understood or thought about the grace given, did more for me

than any thing that came before it, and the Communions which followed, though I regarded them as little more than times for receiving special grace and strength. To a certain extent the dread of Tractarianism in my home was becoming modified. We were allowed Wilberforce's *Eucharistica* as an Altar manual, and perhaps a more advanced book would not have been so well fitted for me. I began to teach at the school, and the study and investigation of the Catechism and Prayer Book also cleared up many difficulties. But I grievously needed external help. Talking and arguing, as before, superseded the inner practical work, as I was once kindly told by a relative who sympathized with my views, during a Sunday afternoon's walk, which left an abiding trace on my life. My adviser unfortunately soon after himself drifted away from the faith he then held, and ended, finally, in Rationalism. But the greatest practical era was the day in which the third volume of *Plain Sermons*, by Dr. Pusey, was put into my hands. It was first shown me at an evening party; and I had no sooner opened it, than I saw that it would supply the want I had felt so long. I forgot the presence of every one, and it must have been after a long interval that I was roused by a remark on the gravity of my studies. I took the book home, and sat up most of the night over it. For a long time it was every thing to me, and first brought definitely before me the duty of self-denial in things lawful, and of fasting and mortification. Then every day increased the desire to have the advice of some priest. Confession had never entered my head; but to be helped and counselled was becoming almost a necessity.

For a long time we had seen but little of Mr. Willis. He had been absent from England, and had married, and I am not sure that he was thought wholesome company for my brothers. However, the next time he came I summoned up courage, but with great difficulty, to speak to him, just as he was going away, and told him I wanted him to talk to me next time he came. I needed advice about fasting and other things. He had never regarded me as any thing but a child before, and he marvelled much how I could ever have come to think of such things. I stood in great awe of him, but after this, although I saw him only at very rare intervals, the worst feelings of helplessness and bewilderment were gone. Whenever we met, he gave me a few words of counsel or encouragement, to which I looked forward with the greatest eagerness. For I was very lonely. I was obliged to keep my opinions almost entirely to myself; fasting and watching could not be done openly, and books were read in private. Many were kept out of the house, and some of mine

were abstracted and burnt. Dr. Pusey's translations only reached me through the extracts made from them in the *British Magazine*, and I cannot describe how I treasured each word. It was not on the whole a bad discipline, for I learnt to keep silence, and hear that which was to me most dear and sacred condemned without venturing to defend it. From a mere surmise, it came to be a certainty that some adherents of the Catholic movement received and made confessions. I had scarcely out-grown my deeply-rooted early horror of the practice, when it came before my own mind as a personal question. I felt it would do me good. Could I do it? And very speedily the answer came—No, never. Others might, whose sins had been different to mine—I never could. It was *not* necessary for forgiveness;—there was not, I argued, the least need to be uneasy, not the least, not the *very* least. GOD forgave all who were penitent, and I was quite sure I wished I had never done some things; but as to telling about them, it would be highly undesirable. I would make a special confession to GOD, and think no more about it. Somehow, after this, I did not improve. There was a skeleton in my closet, and I was not so happy in it as I had been. There was something I did not dare to do; but yet it was true that my theology, as I then held it, did not teach the necessity of confession. I was then, I think, what might colloquially be called a moderate Anglican. I believed in Baptismal Regeneration, but I had retained the Protestant idea that the "Divine Nature" then imparted, was simply a Divine Influence. I believed theoretically in the Real Presence, but practically I regarded the Blessed Sacrament as more an act of communion with GOD, than as a reception of Him. I held the English Church to be the only uncorrupt branch of the Church, and supposed myself bound to accept every word of her formularies.

From the time that I realized the nature of the Church movement in my own day, I felt that its furtherance was the one thing to live for. The idea of Sisterhood life occurred to me for a moment, but it never became really a desire. I hoped at a future time to find some one like-minded with myself—a layman—for I had seen even then that the marriage of the clergy was an utter mistake. I still had a great dread of Romanism, although an acquaintance I then made with a Roman Catholic gentleman convinced me that my childish dread of such persons was unfounded. He belonged to an old Roman Catholic family, never introduced the subject of his faith unless desired, and manifested none of the intolerance of the convert. Meantime, Church architecture and restoration had become some of my principal studies,

and they naturally led me into regions of symbolism which unfolded doctrine, and taught me as much as treatises could have done. But I was living too much in externals, and offering myself and my work with not only the joyous enthusiasm of a young and fresh nature, but with an admixture of the personal and the self-conceited which (as I was afterwards to experience) must always cause the rejection of services so rendered. I believe my principles were worth very little at this time, and that I should easily have surrendered them if I had been tempted to do so. I was then also much thrown with a gentleman of great abilities and rationalistic tendencies, and though he never had any influence over me, yet my own mind was critical enough to see the force of the reasoning he used, though happily my belief in the Church's infallibility in the interpretation of Scripture was a sufficient safeguard, and kept me from indulging in any such speculations. Many of the objections I have subsequently seen brought forward against the Old Testament history occurred, unsuggested, to myself; and for years I thought it wiser never to read the Old Testament at all. I do not think I ever surrendered my faith for a moment in any one point of Catholic truth; but I look upon that part of my life as passed among pitfalls of all kinds, and it was only because some special temptations were mercifully averted, that I was saved from utter spiritual ruin.

About this time I learnt wisdom through some foolish experiences, and began to find my own judgment not quite so infallible as I had supposed it, and also that I had been altogether getting careless and lax. Once more the thought of confession recurred importunately, partly from hearing of it as so much resorted to by those who were really in earnest. Mr. Willis was a true friend, and after much struggling with myself, I felt that I might perhaps manage to make a confession to one who had counselled me so often and so well. And so time had gone on till the autumn of 1849, when I was to pay a visit to Mr. and Mrs. Willis by myself. Then, I thought, would be the time; and having made, as I considered, sufficient preparation, I spoke to Mr. Willis about it. He quite agreed that confession would do me a great deal of good, but decidedly declined to hear me himself. Confessions, he thought, should not be made to intimate friends; but if I liked, he would write for me to a priest he knew in London, and get him to undertake my case. I had not contemplated this, but there was no drawing back; and in a short space I had a letter from this gentleman, enclosing a book of directions for self-examination, which made me perceive that I had rather hastily concluded myself to be ready. I had not the most distant idea how

a confession was made, and was too shy even to ask Mr. Willis much about it. I had a month for final preparation, and went to meet Mr. Goodwin, for the first time, in London at the beginning of Advent. None of my relations had the least idea of my intentions, except one, who raised some doubts in my mind about acting without the sanction of my parents. But they did not much weigh with me. I was then no longer a child; we had always been allowed a considerable measure of independence, and I felt too that the interests at stake were beyond any human interference, and that I alone could be accountable for my own soul. To have felt compelled to go to confession in direct contravention of parental commands, was a conceivable possibility, but one to be avoided at all risks.

I do not think I felt much apprehension then at the thought of the act itself, beyond ordinary nervousness. I believed I knew what my own part of it would be, and what I should have to say. So I went to meet my confessor at the appointed time in his large, dreary, London church, and after a short conversation in the vestry, he took me into the building, and left me for a while, according to the custom then in existence there, kneeling at the Altar-rail, until he returned in his surplice, and after a few prayers, took his place by my side. My confession occupied nearly six hours on two successive days—so long a time being necessary, in consequence of the imperfect preparation which, in my ignorance, I had supposed to be sufficient.

Years have passed since then—days and weeks of severe suffering, mental and bodily; but never any thing that can be compared to those hours, and the weeks that followed them, and I know that I never can pass through any thing worse on the earth-side of the grave. My own history was comparatively soon told, and freely; but Mr. Goodwin was experienced enough to see that neither conscience or memory had been fully roused. I think he was more severe than he would have been, if he had not mistaken ignorance and nervous terror for obstinacy or evasion; but notwithstanding, I have never since met his equal as a confessor, or ceased to be grateful for all he did for me. It was a terrible, but most necessary hour of self-revelation, and showed me the evil of my life, as the preparatory self-examination had, strangely enough, completely failed to show it me. We think that when the life is investigated, and memory taxed to its utmost, then the inner self stands completely revealed, and that the recital to another can add nothing to the knowledge of the past. Many persons think so, and that their sins confessed in secret to GOD are fully confessed. I believe it to be a most fatal

mistake; and that, brought up with a superficial knowledge of sin, as all Protestants are, the conscience of a person who has never been to confession probably has never, and never will be, fully investigated. "Fully," after all, means but imperfectly, even when confession is over; but yet I feel sure that the guilt of individual acts, and still more, the relative proportion of sins to one another, and to the whole spiritual life, can be known in no other way. And this accounts for the mass of careless, unspiritual Anglicans who neglect confession, and who avoid great sins, but never seem to make real progress in holy living. I, at all events, found out the mischief of my life then, undeveloped as my views were at that time of the Sacrament of Penance. I looked upon the priest as a commissioned minister; and I did not see that it was our LORD Himself to Whom I was confessing, and Who was speaking to me; nor did I see, as I have seen since, that the confessor's words are not his own, but that he is under the control of One Who regulates them in a way of which the priest himself is generally unconscious.

I had gone to confession thinking myself rather a good sort of young person on the whole, though I had none of the ideas popularly attributed to Catholics, that my own doings were of the least value in the sight of GOD; but only that He had mercifully preserved me from great sins, and that His holiness would be accepted instead of mine. I went home with very different ideas of myself, wretched enough, but with a feeling of having been rescued from the brink of a precipice. The scene of the confession itself I could not venture to recall. It was months before I could let my thoughts return to it; and even now I cannot dwell upon it without the shrinking with which, in after life, men recall a severe surgical operation, although they may also feel—as I feel—deep thankfulness for its results.

Mr. Goodwin requested me to write to him, when he found that I could do so without any thing underhand, although he did not intend to write to me. Any correspondence in which he engaged must be open, and he declined sending letters in any other way. Consequently, I had to deal with the difficulties and troubles of the next few weeks as I best could, Mr. Willis' advice and letters being my only assistance. The penance assigned me had been unintentionally severe; but there was no means of obtaining any relaxation. The administration of the Sacrament of Penance was, as we know, at that time altogether abnormal in the Church, and I only suffered as all must suffer who are concerned in initiating any thing new and contradictory to prevailing custom. Our children peaceably inherit privileges

which we purchased for them at no easy rate. But these difficulties did not last long for me. After one or two more interviews, Mr. Goodwin desired me to tell my father I had been to confession, and that I found my soul required it. Much as I dreaded doing this, of course I had no alternative; and very greatly to my surprise, I was told that I was old enough to do as I pleased, and my choice of Mr. Goodwin was approved. I have never regretted having gone in the way I did, or felt that I was not most mercifully guided through all the circumstances of the case.

In consequence of the step I had taken, two of my intimate friends were, within a few weeks, led to submit to the same discipline, and, I believe, with benefit for the time; although in both cases the results appeared transitory. One of them soon after fixed his affections where there could be no response, and was shattered in body and mind by a hopeless illness; while the other married a Protestant, and followed the faith of her husband. So that winter passed by, bringing with it, for me, the formation of a friendship with a layman, whose creed and intentions were the same as my own, and who was destined to be more to me than I imagined in that time of distress and trouble.

1850 set in gloomily for Churchmen. The pending decision of the Gorham case was beginning every day to agitate their minds more and more. Such decisions were so new, and the limits and jurisdiction of the State Courts were so little understood, that the intellects even of the best theologians were distressed and bewildered, and they failed to comprehend the real weight and bearings of these legal tribunals. Surmises and apprehensions of what the Privy Council judgment would be and would involve, grew to be more and more formidable in prospect, until people really came to think that the faith of the English Church in the Catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism was trembling in the balance. Not one leading writer on the subject at that time understood the difference between the State's decisions for the Establishment, and the Church's decisions for the Church; while the few who did, were opposed even by those who led public opinion and might have been expected to know better. The Court of Arches was imagined to give the true and spiritual, as well as legal judgment of the Archbishop; and it was argued that an appeal from this Court should and could only be made to a Synod.

Of course the anxieties and difficulties came to me in all their fulness; and I went with some apprehension to consult Mr. Goodwin, whose sermons had already become the property of the public. I shall not soon forget that day in March, when

first the possibility of leaving the English Church came before me. Mr. Goodwin thought, like many others, that the decision committed the English Church to heresy, unless at once repudiated; but that there was nothing for us to do except to wait in patience and prayer for deliverance. Those subsequent weeks were times of strange anxiety. Pamphlets and sermons were pouring in constant succession from the press; and all, as we know now, made the same mistake. Mr. Keble wrote that "many, though sympathizing with our view of this great cause, were far from realizing its alarming, nay possibly fatal, importance to us at this moment." The Bishop of Exeter's "Letter" perhaps raised the hopes of most of the desponding for a time. The excitement about this Letter in London, on the day it came out, was wonderful. Published at ten in the morning, it had gone into a third edition by twelve o'clock, and reached a fifth in the evening. Still, it did not reverse the Judgment, and depression soon returned. Mr. Maskell speedily gave up the matter in despair. Catholics were divided among themselves, some urging one course as sufficient to free the English Church from the heresy; and others declaring it ineffective, and demanding something else.

Mr. Goodwin was more and more hopeless every time I visited him. In May, after the plan for forming a Secession Church (which was at one time proposed) came to nothing, he told me that he found no Church open to him except the Roman. He said that he had obediently taught only the doctrines of the English Church while he could conscientiously obey her; but now that her doctrine of Baptism was changed, and he could do so no more, he must leave her for Rome, although he still intended to wait until every thing should have been tried. His view of the case was, that the Church of England had given up to the State, or Civil power, that jurisdiction over doctrine which was committed to the Church's own exclusive keeping by our LORD Himself, and so he felt that he must leave her. He would not sanction my attending any Roman Catholic service, or taking any step, until all hope should finally be over. He endeavoured to encourage me in meeting the heavy trials which leaving the Church must entail; and I was only then just learning the extent of the sacrifice I must make. But I think we both felt that these considerations were but secondary. He gave me his fervent blessing, and we parted, never again to meet in this world. He was much blamed subsequently, for continuing to act as my spiritual guide when his own confidence in the authority he possessed was shaken; but I can hardly see how he could have done otherwise. And strangely enough, but for steadily

following his advice, I should unquestionably have seceded then. The very next day I was offered a ticket by a friend (also strongly disposed to secede) to go and hear Dr. Newman; and had I gone, I should certainly have asked his advice at that time, and I know what the result would have been. Some time afterwards I actually set out from home to walk to the nearest Roman Catholic Chapel, intending to consult the priest, when this very direction recurred to me, and I felt that if I once abandoned the landmarks that were left to me, I should have no hope of being guided aright. Another opportunity of receiving advice seemed to open. A distinguished preacher and confessor in our own communion was announced to preach in London on the following Sunday, and I went to hear him, and requested an interview afterwards. I told him how I was circumstanced with regard to Mr. Goodwin, and what an awful step I felt leaving the Church of England to be. He was at that time, although no one knew it, meditating secession himself; and consequently, although he gave me no indication of this, his inquiries were more directed to ascertain whether I knew what I was talking about, and was really free from underhand motives. He wished me to write out a statement of my difficulties, to be laid before Dr. Pusey: but this I knew Mr. Goodwin would dislike, and I declined. He gave me general advice to do nothing hastily, told me that there were questions of the intellect, which was very likely to be deceived, recommended checking thoughts by a life of devotion, and finally arranged to have a longer conversation with me the next day. He was suddenly called away from London that morning, and though he appointed me to come two days after, I received a summons home in the meantime, and the meeting never took place. I found afterwards that Mr. Goodwin perfectly approved of the step I had taken, and that he and my new friend were quite agreed.

I now set myself to read and to think. I soon saw that the Gorham case mattered little in itself; but that the mischief, if any where, lay in the transfer of decisions concerning doctrine from spiritual to temporal authorities. I did not after this conceal my difficulties, or what I thought would be their probable solution; and of course many friends remonstrated with me. Mr. Willis at once wrote to me. He told me that I knew he was not prejudiced in favour of the English Church, and yet that he saw no reason for leaving her now. A Church, because it could not meet in Synod, but which, if it did meet, would assuredly pronounce against heresy, could not be considered heretical. He cautioned me against being dazzled by the idea of self-

sacrifice, as marking the path of duty, urged me to wait and see if the evil would not be remedied, and contended that a spiritual guide advising any one to secede to Rome was guilty of a suicidal act. If he were right in giving the advice, he had no power to give it; and, in truth, he acknowledged himself to be a layman, and without authority, by the mere fact of so doing.

This letter did not reach my difficulties, which, in common with those of other doubters of that time, had drifted off into the nature of the Royal supremacy, and its permitted spiritual usurpations. We talked together afterwards, but I could scarcely venture to listen to him. I read various Roman books at this time, and I found authoritative Roman doctrines to be very different from the popular statements of them, and nothing in their teaching that would absolutely prevent me from entering the Roman Church. But I also saw, and it is curious that I should have seen it then, that the truth of Tridentine doctrine by no means proved the falsity of that of the English Church. I began to ask the Saints to pray for me, and to see that the denial of the chalice to the laity did not necessitate a half reception of the Blessed Sacrament. The veneration of the Blessed Virgin I perceived to a certain extent really exalted our Divine LORD, by showing the dignity attached to every thing connected with the Incarnation, and that Protestants misunderstand it because they practically degrade Him to the level of a Saint, and then of course are shocked at any human creature being compared with Him. "I believe," I wrote at this time, "that there are abuses, but nothing that can be called error, in the Church of Rome. As to Rome cutting us off, it had provocation enough to do so; but if we have a secession Church, we may hope for speedy reunion." The debate on the Bishop of London's bill for a change in the Court of Appeal seemed to me conclusive proof that those were right who accused the Crown of exercising a spiritual supremacy, and I began to imagine the case was lost. But the more I investigated, the more it seemed to appear that, if so, it was brought about by no intentional act of the English Church. It was a claim made, indeed (or so I then understood), by the sovereign, but rejected by the Church, and only slowly and surreptitiously assumed as time went on, and ignorance prevailed, and Convocation was silenced. If I could once see it as an act of aggression against the Church, and not an act of treason to our LORD on her part, I thought my way would be cleared. Archdeacon Wilberforce's charge shed some hopeful rays of light on the subject; but that also was founded on the fallacy, that the English Church was committed to heresy pas-

sively, and must undo the mischief. Afterwards, as we know now, the Synod of Exeter vindicated the only diocese that was implicated; and although I have always regretted that the Bishop of Exeter did not send an orthodox priest to supersede Mr. Gorham, yet it became apparent, as time went on, that the Archbishop had tyrannically thrust a heretic into an unwilling diocese, not that the diocese had wilfully accepted him. I also began to see that even if what was alleged about the Supremacy were true, it did not affect the English Succession; nor, unless a conscious and wilful act, could it affect the vitality of the Church. Courayer certainly did not write as though he could see any such wilful surrender of her birthright, although he evidently regarded the Royal Supremacy as a spiritual, and not a temporal one.

These were terrible months, and every day brought its contrary impressions, and its almost-conclusions, in both directions. I could only pray earnestly for light; but for a long time every fresh leading seemed to point the same way. There was the fear always present with me, that any resolution to stay contentedly in the English Church would be the result of the preponderance of earthly motives. They were all, even to religious predilection, on one side; and I loved the Anglican service far more than I do now. I remember attending one of the best choral services then in London, and feeling most bitterly that I must lose all share in that beloved ritual if I seceded. The incumbent of the church, I believe, did his best to give me an opportunity of opening my mind to him, but I could not avail myself of it. I have often been sorry that he should have died without my ever being able to tell him how grateful I felt to him. The crisis came, I think, one night when, after a long vigil, I fell asleep, and had a vivid and enticing dream of all that might, if I chose, be mine. I remember half waking to a very different reality, signing myself with the cross, and making an act of renunciation of it all, if GOD should call. The next day came the first gleam of light.

By degrees the question resolved itself for me into a belief that "the English Church is still a part of the Catholic Church, unless she sinned sufficiently at the Reformation to justify Rome in cutting her off;" and there for a time I thought the subject of investigation lay. I never regarded the severance of the two Communions as the act of the English Church herself. History was against this view; but I thought there might be a foundation for the charges of Protestant heresy which were brought against her. There was a tone of argument current at that time, which accused the English Church of intentionally making her

formularies ambiguous to admit heretics; but it seemed to me then, when I came to inquire, and does still seem, that the cordial acceptance of the former Liturgy, in which the language on the disputed points was decisive, is a proof that the Church meant her words to be understood in no Protestant sense. And so, I think, by degrees my doubts sank down into a fear, whether I was not disregarding the leadings of the HOLY SPIRIT by not following one whose advice had been so blessed to me, and whether I was not allowing earthly motives to weigh down and overbalance the pleadings of a higher call. About this time I received decisive orders from my father, that I was to go to Mr. Goodwin no more. I wrote to him at once and told him so. He sent me an affectionate farewell, begging me to do nothing on impulse, and reminding me that the truth would bear any amount of investigation; but also not to resist the leadings of the HOLY SPIRIT, and to set eternity before me in all my decisions. I parted from him with great sorrow; but I felt that it was no doing of my own, and that there could be no shadow of reason for disobedience to this parental command, as I was not cut off from confession itself. I never again heard from him, and missed him when I afterwards called. He entered the Roman Catholic Church some months afterwards, and died in that communion a few years ago. I think this separation virtually disposed of one difficulty, but still the other remained.

Almost a necessary consequence of my at length deciding that I had no ground for quitting the Anglican Communion, was a marriage engagement. For a time, it seemed as if it would be almost well to resign this, with mutual consent, as a test of sincerity. I consulted one whose advice Catholics in our days have always been accustomed to look upon with great reverence, and received a careful answer. He told me that, believing me right in remaining in the English Communion, he could not advise as though it were doubtful. He thought "it hardly possible that earthly motives could have changed my whole way of viewing the relations of the English and Roman Churches imperceptibly;" and he believed "that I had been carried away for the time by the general disquiet, and by argument on one side, and that when this impression had subsided, I should see things as before." Looking back at this distance of time, I think he was right. To a Roman it would of course appear that I had a decided call into the true Church, and allowed myself to reject it for earthly reasons. Certainly every year of reading and reflection since, while it has removed many prejudices, and awakened more and more strongly my reverence for the Roman Church, and taught

me the great beauty of her services, does not lead me for one moment to think the grounds upon which I then contemplated leaving the English Communion otherwise than entirely mistaken. Had the Roman Church been the only true one, and had I then entered her fold, I must still have felt now, that I came to a right decision from a falsified view of facts. Whether renunciation of the worldly advantages gained by my decision might not have been the higher course, is another matter; and I do not suppose that in this world I shall ever resolve the question, in itself now a useless one. I know that the path I chose, which I trusted would have led to an active life of special devotion to GOD'S work, has carried me into regions of suffering and desolation, perhaps lower, perhaps higher than those to which I aspired. I was directed to pray for serious illness, if what I had done in this matter was not in accordance with the will of GOD, and I have never been well since; but I would not part with one day's suffering now. It is not till we emerge from our entangled path on to the mountain-top, that we can see whether it is higher than the eminence we had intended to ascend. But that it has been *better* for me, whether higher or lower, I doubt nothing; and I know now, that services offered as mine were offered, and accompanied with so much evil, could never have been accepted. But I knew nothing of this then; and the life to which I had always looked forward seemed about to be realized. A difficulty arose; happily only temporary, about the Sacrament of Penance, as administered by the priest who was to become my confessor. It is one of the many instances in which I feel that if temptation had not been mercifully withdrawn, I should probably have been led to compromise my principles.

Some of the "views" I had learnt to take during the recent time of distress became modified, but others remained. At first I plunged into active parochial work, and avoided controversy altogether. My opportunities for confession were very rare, owing to the distance at which I now lived from my spiritual guide. He gave me up, after a time, for a director nearer to me; but another change of residence and increasing ill-health rendered intercourse almost an impossibility, especially as a perfect stranger could not be expected to make any great efforts in the matter. For some years I prepared for it every Lent and Advent, but something always hindered our meeting one another; and the effort, always to me a very great one, could scarcely have been made safely if accompanied by any bodily fatigue. Perhaps during this time I was mainly learning the connexion between bodily suffering and the hold upon that Anchor within the veil which is

either tightened or swept away when flesh and heart fail us. But I believe the loss of confession was a grievous injury to me, and that it can never be intermitted when once begun habitually, without the deprivation being seriously felt by the soul. Probably it was all the worse for me, from my having become a weekly communicant. Once I sent for one of the clergy of the place where I lived, but he declined hearing my confession; and I vainly tried to console myself with the thought that an invalid life was probably preserved from any great sins. But I did see that devotion was comparatively neglected, and daily faults were repeated without compunction; and I resolved, as soon as change of residence should make it possible, to place myself under the guidance of some one in London. I can scarcely tell the happiness it was to me again to receive absolution, although it was but a step to perhaps deeper searching of the inner life than I had ever yet undergone. Every earthly comfort was to fail me, and GOD Himself apparently to withhold His Presence, and leave me in solitude only invaded by the voice of conscience. Those are the hours that turn us from Anglicans into Catholics, and drive us from the theoretical superstructure to the inner citadel; from a belief in the perfections of the English Church, to confidence in the Church Universal alone as the Bride of CHRIST; from a reverent belief in Our LORD'S Divine Power, to the depths of His Human Sympathy with sorrow; from a sentimental satisfaction in daily service, to a sense of the desolation to be endured where His Sacramental Presence is not; and through our first lessons of voluntary suffering, into the closest and tenderest affinities with Him that can exist where that Presence in the Blessed Sacrament is denied. It is only at the foot of the Cross, and in affectionate sympathy with its agony, that we really learn what our own sin is, and what it cost the SON of GOD to gain for us the happiness He has created us to enjoy. It is only at the foot of the Altar that we can learn how to adore both the adorable Natures there present, to be united with us and substituted for our own.

Nearly up to this time I had been still in great ignorance of many essentials of the Catholic faith, although they dawned upon me by degrees. One leading idea had been given me in ordinary conversation by a priest. He pointed out that Dissenters and all Protestants knew nothing whatever really of union with CHRIST, although they talked of it. They could believe in Him and love Him, conform their hearts and minds to His will, and hope in Him; but to be *united* with Him is an idea utterly beyond the reach of any one who does not comprehend the true intention of the Sacraments. Once in this way shown me, and

I saw it immediately. I have ever since perceived that this is the fundamental difference between all Protestants and all Catholics, although many, even of the latter, do not recognize it. A sermon I subsequently heard in London supplied some of the subordinate details of this truth; although otherwise Dr. Pusey's writings are almost the only well-known ones which really combat the defective teaching of Protestantism on this subject. He lays it down very clearly in his *Eirenicon*. Roman Catholic divines of eminence teach it very fully; but never seem to me to see in their controversial writings, that Protestants accept it in words and deny it in reality. To believe that our union with our LORD is a union of Nature, and not an influence exercised by Him over us, is dependent on a right faith in the Incarnation; and upon that doctrine Protestants, whatever they may think or say, are never in reality orthodox.

It is very seldom that, being such as we are, this union with our LORD can be effected in us by the painless operation of the Sacraments. We little think, when we begin our course, of the mystery involved in the simple sentence, "I am the Way;" or what weary stages of loss and increase, injury and renewing at bitter cost, our as yet imperfect union must undergo before it is sufficiently developed or restored to bring us in blessed reality to the FATHER. Spiritual guides can seldom be any comfort in these stages of our history. They are of the greatest possible *value*, because these are seasons of danger as well as of trial. But there are paths of the spirit which must be trodden before they can be known; and they differ so materially in details for each soul, that the best-intended words of comfort must necessarily fail in their object, and are probably permitted to do so as a part of the soul's discipline. Every thing that the most affectionate kindness and thoughtful care could do for me was done. I was directed to make a monthly confession, and told, as I had fully experienced, that there is very little progress to be made in the spiritual life without it. I thankfully and gratefully acknowledge a long and untiring course of wise treatment and counsel, strangely and providentially adapted to circumstances which are only known to GOD and my own soul.

There are some persons who depend so much upon human sympathy, that it would become a great hindrance to their spiritual progress. Trials are often sent to them with which no human being can sympathize, and GOD, although sustaining the soul, leaves it to endure them in what seems like solitude and desertion. Object and future result are alike hidden, and the sufferer often feels that he is entirely misusing and wasting the

discipline, through ignorance of what it is intended to effect, while the soul loses its last spark of comfort by feeling that it has no right to re-echo the cry, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" The "why" is but too apparent. But so our higher life must be matured.

It is impossible to pass over altogether these phases of spiritual existence with which no stranger should intermeddle, because their effect is to destroy, more or less, the essential characteristics of Anglicanism. All our own standard writers are found powerless to help us; and the conventionalities and dry counsels of such writers as Jeremy Taylor become dusty on our shelves. Those men could guide the moral and practical part of the spiritual life; but for the depths beyond, we require both a mental conformation and a theology different from theirs. Only Roman Catholic ascetic writers can give us what we need; and so we turn more eagerly and teachably towards them. But far beyond all books is the possession of that blessed Presence which in general is given to us in our churches so grievously seldom, and for such a few moments, instead of being, as it is to our more fortunate Roman brethren, an abiding joy and resource continually. At the foot of the Altar alone we learn what our life is, and what our sorrows mean—that here is the point where Heaven and earth meet, and where GOD Incarnate, under the form of Bread, joins our manhood in His with the GODHEAD. This conviction, when it once mastered my own mind, dissipated my last fancy that the practice of the Anglican Communion was superior to the Roman. Granted all manner of abuses present on their side and absent from ours, but nothing can ever make up for the loss of that perpetual Presence, or for the practical change which has turned our clergy from a sacrificing priesthood into a preaching ministry.

I learnt now for the first time the real value of bodily mortifications. Hitherto I had looked upon them as wholesome self-chastisement for sin, and means of bracing and disciplining the soul, or as simple acts of obedience. Now I saw their higher purpose, and that they place the soul in sympathy with our LORD as nothing else can. They are sweet to us, because they give us to feel, in however small a degree, the same suffering for His sake that He endured for ours. They are the soul's approach to sit down under His shadow, where the atoning Blood can best fall upon it to give remission and purification. On this and on other points the teaching of the Catholic school was undergoing a change. Our Blessed LORD'S Divinity having been restored to its true place in our belief, and a foundation of practical holiness

laid securely, the Love of JESUS could be once more safely dwelt upon and spoken of, while also it was increasing and becoming really greater in the hearts of a new generation of teachers. Habitual confession had done its true work for them, and they were far more fitted for preachers of the Gospel than their predecessors, whose attention had been almost entirely given to dogma, and who had little experience in guiding souls beyond the outskirts of the spiritual life. It needs but to contrast the sermons preached, for instance, at the consecration of S. Barnabas, Pimlico, with those we hear now at other churches within the octave of a similar event. That revival of *true* Evangelical teaching has done more for the inner work of the movement, than any one thing I can remember. It was a just accusation, that at one time nothing was preached about but the Church, and that personal love to our Blessed LORD was overlooked. Perhaps it was necessary to lay again the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST, as S. Paul calls baptisms and laying on of hands; but with him we may be glad when we have teachers who can go on unto perfection, and lead us through a repentance cemented by confession, humiliation, and self-discipline, to Sacramental union with our LORD. The Blessed Sacrament is the soul's one reliable consolation in its dark hour, and if that is withheld, we can only mourn over our unworthiness even of the far-off sight of Him, like penitents in ancient times. Still we should only injure ourselves, by seeking in another Communion that which, after all, is but denied us in the tenderest anxiety for our ultimate good. Our place is appointed us among Protestants, and in a Communion deeply tainted in its practical system by Protestant heresy; but our duty is the expulsion of the evil, and not flight from it, any more than it is a duty for those to leave the Roman Church, who become conscious also of abuses within her system.

All this became more and more clear to me when circumstances brought me into contact with the Union movement. This arose when the tide of secession was past, and owed its continuance for a long time mainly to the untiring labours of one priest (whom may GOD long bless and preserve), until now it is as much an influence leavening the English Church as the Ritual and Sisterhood revivals themselves.

Nothing at first could have appeared more hopeless; for Roman Catholics considered it a necessary part of their faith to deny our existence as a Church, and therefore would not admit even the possibility of reunion with a nonentity. Anglicans, on the other hand, were hard to dispossess of their belief that the Roman Church must resign what was called her "distinctive teaching"

before we could seek for unity. At first I was startled when I found friendly intercourse and fellowship existing between Anglo-Catholic and Anglo-Roman priests, and I had some lingering Anglican notions on the subject of "Our Church," which were first shaken by a paper bearing that title in the *Union Review*. Our Church is, after all, the English body of bishops and priests, providing those who live in England with the grace of the Sacraments; but to call ourselves members of any local Church, and feel bound to adhere to the creed of any local Church, in distinction to that of the Universal Church, is manifestly a mere modernism. We cannot imagine S. John declaring himself a member of the Church of Ephesus, or, for that matter either, a member of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church.

For a long time, too, I thought that the Roman Church had much to modify in her dogmatic teaching about "Saint-worship," but I did not then know how little she has authoritatively laid down upon the subject. Protestants are taught from their earliest years to speak to no one beyond this world except GOD the FATHER and our Blessed LORD, with a few rare addresses to GOD the HOLY GHOST. They grow up with a notion, most difficult to eradicate, that speaking to any other invisible being is an act of worship; and it is to be feared that their conception of GOD only attains to that of some indefinitely powerful human person. But, whether this is so or not, they have an idea that to speak, for instance, to S. Paul, and ask his prayers, is an act of worship; and with the same lamentable confusion of idea in another direction, they do not hesitate to ask our Blessed LORD to pray for them. What sort of communion with the Saints they do enjoy, they best know themselves; but I believe it is to them little more than a phrase, which if it had not been in the Apostles' Creed, they would never have recognized at all as an article of belief. I do not think any thing can meet the difficulty they feel on this subject, except the gradual increase of their love and reverence for our Blessed LORD; and then they will naturally perceive how infinitely far below Him the Saints, as persons, really come. But (avoiding the word "worship," which has through long misunderstanding come to convey a false meaning) there is a veneration, accompanied by a sense of inferiority, due to human persons possessing our Blessed LORD'S Nature, which cannot be understood by Protestants, because the attainment of such a dignity by the human race is not in their creed. It was for want of understanding this, that I so long looked on the Greek and Tridentine view of the Saints as giving to them an undue exaltation. When the real troubles of the soul came upon me, I had felt, as many Roman Catholics

have felt, that I wanted *more* than a creature, however powerful, for my friend and consoler. Other names and intercessions may do as helps to taking our place among the family above, but we want One both Human and Divine as our stay. I did not know then that the Roman Church, as Dr. Newman says (whatever many of her sons may have done) "allows no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator." But also, I did not understand then what Saints really were. I could not see why those who were merely men and women should be treated as if they were so much more. The fact was, that though the union of the Christian with our LORD had become no unknown doctrine to me, I never had realized the exaltation in Him of the Mystical Body, or that the word "CHRIST" does not always express the simple idea of "JESUS" alone, but includes the Body as well as the Head. At last I saw the whole thing suddenly, when meditating on the words—"When He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and admired in all them that believe," in connexion with our LORD'S last prayer. Then I saw how the limitation of the old dispensation—"My glory will I not give unto another" was preserved, and yet wonderfully reversed under the new Covenant. "The glory that Thou gavest Me, I have given them;" and that glory is "the glory that I had with Thee before the world was." We do not pay royal honours to a beggar's daughter; but when she is married to a king we do, though they are honours of acquired dignity, not of inherent right. Husband and wife, CHRIST and His Church, are one. "She shall be called, 'The LORD our Righteousness.'" Still, we worship persons, not natures; and, therefore, though their power to help us is mighty, we give them no more than the honour due to creatures; and I could not bring myself to see how the same words could be applied in one sentence to them and to our LORD.

Some short time after, I came upon words which spoke in commendation of a Christian man's faith and love towards JESUS and towards the Saints, and I paused to consider them. Love I could have understood—but faith! and to join the names in the very way that we so strongly object to in Roman Catholic writings! The holy words had been familiar to me from childhood; and, of course, I had taken them in the usual Protestant sense, which in other similar expressions I had long been taught to reject. The subsequent explanatory words only made the original sentence more remarkable; and I thought how eagerly divines would contend that the words here were applied in different senses to JESUS and the Saints, who would never allow such an explanation to the same words in any Catholic writer. The mistake

of Western Christians still seems to me to have been, that they have honoured the Saints apart from our Blessed LORD, just as at some times and in some places they have treated the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice apart from the One Sacrifice. In their dogmatic definitions, they would probably do neither. I see what they mean, or should mean, by their language, and I am content. I know that the love of the Saints and our Lady increases the love of JESUS in the soul; but I believe, too, that *dependence* on the Saints, and the turning to them practically, either first or principally in any trouble, is dangerous and dishonouring to our LORD, although I quite see that a great deal of the language that so repels us may be understood in two senses. I believe, too, that we are as bound to receive Roman language in the best sense it will bear; just as we request from Romans the same consideration in treating our formularies; and we ought not to insist that any particular writer used this language in a sense which he himself distinctly denies, whatever the words may seem to us to imply.

Of course no one interested in theology could have lived through the last few years, without having the awful question of future punishment forced upon his thoughts. At one time I was inclined to consider it an open question, as yet undetermined by the Catholic Church. But, as a Roman Catholic writer has pointed out, the Church has never in any way indicated for how many, or for how few, eternal punishment may be reserved; and the doctrine, or rather any doctrine of purgatory, covers an indefinite portion of the ground on which the subject can be considered. It was first brought before me when I was very young, by the death of a school-girl about twelve years old. She was not a particularly good child, nor a bad child; nor was there any thing in her death to lead us to suppose that she took, then or before, any special personal interest in religion. She was too old to be classed with unconscious infants; there was nothing about her indicating any devotion of the soul to GOD; and yet the notion that she was gone to endless torments was utterly inadmissible. It set me thinking. I see now the perfect consistency of the doctrine, as expressed in the Athanasian Creed, with reason, when the symbolic language necessarily used to express ideas beyond us is not pressed into the language of actual fact, and when also the indestructibility of man's free will is admitted. Reunited Christendom will one day, no doubt, define the doctrine more categorically, and probably the legitimate development of the truths contained in our LORD's descent into Hell will furnish a solution to all difficulties.

I suppose that I have in me quite sufficient taste for doubt and speculation to have made me a rationalist. Unquestionably I should have become one if I had grown up in unenlightened Protestantism. But, by GOD'S mercy, I have seen too plainly from the first the necessity for a divinely-guided Church, to listen to any writer who could question her decrees. If the constant supernatural presence of GOD the HOLY GHOST in the Church is surrendered, all is virtually lost; and I see no logical escape from Biblical criticism, and rapid descent, through latitudinarianism and infidelity, to atheism. But, apart from that consideration, the Catholic faith has never been to me a series of isolated doctrines, of which one or more might be questioned. It is a self-supporting whole—a complete circle; and each doctrine is necessary to its perfection, whether viewed from its inner or from its outer and wider circumference. Since I became a Catholic, my views have developed, but they have never fundamentally changed. The book to which I owe almost every step of my course has been the Holy Scripture itself. While meditating on its words, new light has again and again dawned upon me; and I have afterwards found the same idea and the same connexion of thought in writers reverenced by the Church. I know that suggestions which so come to us must be tested by authority; otherwise I think that the plain sense of the Bible tells much more for the peculiarities of the Roman Catholic faith than against them. This impression in itself is worth nothing; but it is sufficiently strong to make me wonder, why the study of the Bible by the unlearned should be discouraged in the Roman Communion, and why the dislike of her authorities to our version should be so great.

Two ideas will of course occur at once to every reader of this Autobiography. It will be said that I have recorded progressive phases of faith which can have but one termination, and that sooner or later I shall submit to the Roman Catholic Church. I think not. So far as I understand my own mental history, it becomes less and less likely, although for years I have continued to see more plainly what Dr. Pusey has startled many by declaring "that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained *authoritatively*." I believe too that, rightly understood, they are in the main truer statements than our own. But with this comes also the deepening conviction, that the claims of the Papal supremacy have no foundation whatever, and that to confine the true Church of GOD within the limits of the Roman obedience alone, is in reality an absurdity. It can only co-exist, it seems to me, with

ignorance of other nations and their Churches; and can no more survive free intercourse, than could our old-fashioned notion that all Roman Catholics were idolaters. The secessions of the last twenty years have done more to hinder the recurrence of another such exodus than their promoters are aware. To my own mind, secessions to Rome in this country could scarcely have received a more damaging blow than the publication of Dr. Newman's *Apologia*. Had I been wavering, I think the thoughtful reading of that book would have decided me to remain in the English Church. It showed me how completely he misconceived the very nature of the Catholic Church while he was among us, and of course the English Communion also; and it showed, almost startlingly, the progress of the Catholic faith among us since his departure. It is his sectarian notion of an Anglican Church as a distinct entity, which I once, with most of my contemporaries, believed in; and it is one which Unionists soon lose. We acknowledge no doctrines as binding but those of the Universal Church; and if it can be distinctly proved that any thing in the English formularies is contrary to them, we say, and without any doubt of our position, that the English formularies are wrong. But Dr. Pusey's calm and dispassionate reasoning seems to be showing us all, that no part of the Universal Church has in reality committed itself to statements which are not capable of being understood in a Catholic sense, although they have frequently not been so understood, and, taken by themselves, are imperfect.

Freely acknowledging our own faults, and remembering the political complications which may be pleaded in excuse on both sides, we have no desire to treat the Roman body in England any longer as a schism, but rather to work with it (as things now are) on equal terms, for the destruction of all that is not Catholic, and for mutual agreement on all that is. But I believe that secession to it is less and less thought of by those who are called "extreme men." Secession proves itself a failure in individual cases, and can only be justified by a conviction that there exist no sacraments or priesthood in the English Church. And so we labour on, drawing nearer to union with Rome, but receding further from absorption into her existence, as the only reality. Those who seceded while they were yet in a semi-Protestant state like Dr. Newman, and learnt then the fullness of Catholic truth for the first time, will naturally feel as if it could only be attained when they have found it. Had I left the English Church in 1850, and learnt in the Roman the blessedness of the Real Presence as I have since learnt it at our Altars, I should of course have ascribed it to the possession of the reality, instead of the shadow;

whereas it only depended upon a faith which I have attained with advancing years in my own Communion. My personal tastes would certainly lead me to prefer the Roman service to our own; but my duty becomes more clear every year, and my hopes higher for the result of patient continuance in the path appointed me.

It will also be said that personal statements like these are useless, unless they come from those who take the lead among the minds of their age, and that from others they are simply egotistical. If one insignificant person *did* think and act in this way, what does it signify? It can be no rule for others, nor is there any kind of security that the conclusions arrived at are of the smallest value. The history of Protestants becoming Catholics is common enough in these days, and there are no striking events to make this one remarkable. It is for this very reason that I have described it; not because I stand out prominently by exceptional circumstances, but because I am one of *thousands* who underwent, and are still undergoing, the same change, with slightly differing external circumstances, but with the same inner features. Great men mould and are moulded by public events, and they in turn set in motion forces which vibrate to the furtherest point of the social system. So they influence such as I was—such as I am. My generation is passing away, and a new one is arising whose experiences are, as I see, very different, although the same work still goes on. My children have grown up to see their father and mother confessing habitually, and to seek the same blessed discipline themselves; and if in the course of future years their practice of the faith and devotion to our LORD are maintained, they will never have even any temptation to the Protestantism from which we have had to struggle to the light. They may become careless and worldly, or rationalistic speculations may bewilder their intellects, but they will never know real religion in any other form than the Catholic.

Yet I could not have so written, did I not feel that my history is now a thing of the past, and that I can look back upon it almost as if it belonged to another person, thankful for both its sorrows and deliverances, but still more thankful that they are over. Any decided change of thought would now be unnatural, as well as improbable. My creed has been severely tested, and, thank GOD, has never failed me; but every trial leaves me more convinced of the truth of the principles which have carried me on to the end. Yet I do not for one moment mean to dogmatize, or to assert that I know the whole truth now on any subject. The more I look back on my life, the more I see, with deep humiliation, and at the same time with thankfulness, that

my faith has been taught me and preserved to me by a power altogether external to myself. Mine is no history of a powerful will fired by some local enthusiasm, or moulded by some still more powerful masculine will. Had GOD allowed temptations to fall on me at certain periods of my life, I know that I should have surrendered my faith—as all do in reality, who fancy they can still keep their principles intact, and yet give their choicest affections to those who do not share them. The faith of such persons, whether they are men or women, invariably deteriorates—such, but for GOD's mercy, I should have been. I know that He Who has guided me so far, will not cease to guide me now. If I were to live ten years longer, I doubt not that I should see more of Catholic truth than I do now, and I would follow it unhesitatingly, for I believe, after all, that I am but at the beginning—sometimes I think, not even at the beginning—of Christian life. When I read the lives of the Saints, it seems to me that I do not know what repentance is—still less what faith is. But I am in the right way, I yet believe, even if so; and the barren life that I live is the one best adapted by the Eternal Wisdom to my feeble powers. Could I possess higher privileges, I well believe that they would be of no use to me as I am. Did I not believe so, I might indeed be tempted to quit the English Church; for the suspension of the Daily Sacrifice is to me almost the most serious departure from duty of which a Church and priesthood can be capable. But though I personally may suffer from it in this world and in the next world also, it makes no change in my duty; for if GOD saw any other state to be right for me, He could and would appoint it for me any day.

Until then, we must study so to live, that some rays from S. Cyprian's consolation to the Confessors who, by slavery and imprisonment, were cut off from offering the Sacrifice, may also enlighten us in our loneliness and desolation. For a life of penance is akin to confessorship, and may partake of some small portion of its blessings. I do not believe that our LORD'S Presence is as yet frequent enough in the English Communion to supply her with any but a feeble life; and I am sure that, as individuals, we flourish and decay with the light or the absence of our SUN. Daily Celebrations, as they increase, will quicken the languid pulses of Divine life in souls that are unconscious of the blessing granted them; and perhaps in those who are in their blindness ungrateful. We can be, at the best, but penitents: saintliness may be our hope for our children, who have not their faith to unlearn, and whose early lives will not be always a remembrance of sin, and of duty unpractised because not known.

The course of my life has been far indeed from what I should have chosen, and the life of active service I once presumptuously entered upon has been denied me. There is a sermon of Dr. Manning's, preached while he was among us, on the Hidden Power of CHRIST'S Passion, which gives the key to such histories, although for the final solution of the mystery of our lives, we must wait for the end. But from the time my mind first opened to understand any thing about it, I knew, first by instinct, and then by reason, that the Catholic movement was the best hope for my Church and my country, and would give me the only creed that could satisfy my own soul. I have called it instinct, but I believe it was the direct leading of the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD. None that I have known who have learnt the truth, and sincerely practised it, have ever turned away from it. I have known those who once seemed to fulfil these conditions, and who have receded from the faith; but I never knew a case where the conscience had not been in some way violated, or where (as for instance by marriage) an opposing influence was not allowed to overpower previous convictions, or where pride of intellect and independence of thought were not permitted to destroy the humility and submission which are axiomatic to the Catholic. In a word, I have known many Protestants become Catholics by a slow growth in grace and earnestness; but I never knew a devout Catholic become a Protestant, without there being something radically wrong, followed by general deterioration of the spiritual life.

There were many enthusiastic young people of my generation, who talked a great deal, and lived in externals; and they, perhaps, if they fell under other influences, might find the satisfaction of their souls in Protestantism, but then it would be the first heart-felt religion they had ever known. If so, they would probably afterwards imagine that the Catholic faith is to others the unhappy sham that it was to themselves. In a few years all these phases of rising and declining faith will have been superseded by others, and, if their early history is forgotten, the most remarkable change that religion in England has ever undergone, will be but imperfectly recorded. Therefore I believe that a really true history, however inconsiderable in itself, becomes of importance in its results, though not in its details, when it represents more than itself alone; and especially if it relates the effect of forces not confined to one person, but of forces which have been felt in wide-spread action over all the country at the same time.

The general aspect of religious parties has much changed within my experience. The Broad Church, or Rationalistic school,

which Dr. Arnold may be said to have originated, has risen into a distinct phase of thought, and has, as Dr. Pusey perceives, done its worst. But Bishop Colenso has practically been the ruin of its influence, for its adherents have no defence whatever against him. Moreover, the lives and practice of its leading men do not win public confidence. Failure in the manly virtue that could frankly acknowledge a mistake, has shaken the general faith in the results of "muscular Christianity;" and there is also a conviction that its system of education, in one prominent instance, has not been a success. A low moral tone, too, has been sanctioned by those who maintain a nominal belief in formularies whose teaching has avowedly been renounced, which will never commend itself to the higher English mind. All these facts unconsciously influence many who never, perhaps, have troubled themselves to inquire into the causes of the general impressions they receive. Nevertheless Broad Churchmanship is undoubtedly popular with those who require an easy-going and refined religion, with sufficient poetry to be soothing and elevating, and sufficient practical good sense to make life cheerful, and death a certain advantage. But it has no secure foundation except on what it increasingly finds to be an insecure Revelation. Rationalists and Broad Churchmen are in the same relative position to one another that Catholics occupy towards Anglicans—accepting the same fundamental principles, but withheld by various causes from pressing them to their legitimate conclusions.

Evangelicals have much changed. Intellect is found among them no more, and worldliness has sapped their earnestness. Bitter invective has taken the place of hard work, and conventional has succeeded to actual self-denial. A man may live a self-indulgent life, or amass money, without losing caste among them—but he must not enter a theatre. A woman may dress in the height of the fashion, play croquet, and flirt, without any condemnation—if only she does not dance. Catholics may and do lay themselves open to charges of self-indulgence, but then they do not condemn some few of the usages of society on principle, and practise the rest; but they contend that the renunciation of all pleasure may be, and is, the higher and more excellent way. Nevertheless, they are far too often found taking the lower way, without any special care to inquire whether it is the course in which their duties lie. Broad Churchmen and Rationalists will generally frankly tell you that they live for this world quite as much as for the next; and that indeed to live wisely for this world is the best way to gain another—and they are consistent.

The Catholic school too has greatly changed. It deals less

with dry dogma and first principles, less with moral duties and fixed devotion, and has far more of the spirituality and fervour that changes ordinary Christianity into the first stage of saintliness, where the foundation is secure. The affections of the soul are drawn out, as well as its powers directed to subdual of evil. Confession is looked upon as necessary for all who are earnestly pressing towards the mark, rather than as a penitential discipline, or a relief to the burdened conscience. The Universal Church, and not the Church of England, is becoming the standard to which doctrine and practice must be conformed, and the advantages in many respects of other divisions of it over our own are becoming recognized. Our LORD is adored as well as received in the Blessed Sacrament; and as a necessary consequence, we desire to surround His Presence with all the dignity that elaborate ceremonial can bestow. The natural consequence of believing Him to be present there as He was in the streets of Jerusalem is, that we desire Him to abide with us always, so that our intercourse with Him may not be confined to one "brief bright hour," but that the Tabernacle of GOD may be with men, and He be with them all days. So, like stars seen one by one on a summer evening, first in one church and then in another, His perpetual Presence reappears among us, each additional tabernacle being the centre of untold additional blessing to us all. Prayer increases, and the direct and remarkable answers it receives almost induce me to believe that, before very long, such answers will assume a more directly supernatural character. But this cannot be without severer mortification than we have as yet practised, and which it is of no use to attempt in advance of the leading of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT.

Nothing could look to me more like a solid work than the progress of Catholic faith and practice as I remember it. Eccentric men diverge and die off, leaving no doubt something valuable behind them, but the main body goes on steadily rising in all that can elevate a Christian community. Sisterhoods have long since become fixed institutions, and monasteries will soon become equally common. We shall never again be without them. The question of vows really lies for solution with those who have to make them; and the inferiority of institutions which do not admit them has in reality decided the matter, though words may still be spoken about it on both sides. Seeming defeats have been practical victories throughout the history of the movement, and unexpected advances, like Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, every now and then astonish even the most sanguine.

Still there will be opposition enough for some time to come to keep all who are at work from the dangers of popularity. Their great peril seems to me to lie in defective self-denial; admiring the lives of the Saints, but reading them in easy-chairs; admitting the blessings of celibacy, and marrying as soon as opportunity offers; recommending fasting to every body—except themselves. In this, as in other things, our knowledge becomes clearer, while the pressure of an increasingly luxurious age becomes harder to resist.

Nevertheless I have seen enough of the probable future of events to resign my active share in the hopes and fears attending it, with sure trust and joy. I do not believe that when I go, as soon I must, my interest will die in all that I leave behind me. From the Land where I trust my soul will be purified, and increasing light gradually dispel all its shadows, I shall see the growing power of truth and the reunion of Christendom, with a clearer understanding than I can now, and with peace and rest, increasing as the intercessions for me increase. But I cannot then know more surely than I know now the truth of the Catholic Faith, and that this alone is the truth as it is in JESUS. So I believe, in a few years, all that love Him will find. They will find too that, however they may have loved Him and rested upon Him (as they may think) so far as it can be done in this life, they know comparatively nothing of Him, until they have met Him, and adored Him, and touched Him, and taken Him home to their inmost souls in the Blessed Sacrament. Catholics know what it is to meet Him in prayer as Protestants do, and far beyond this, according to their degree of faith, what it is to meet Him at the Altar; and they know that no comparison between the two acts can be made. Many hearts, doubtless, burn within even those whose eyes are holden; but to know even as they are known, is a blessedness of which they little dream. This Presence is the practical centre of Christian worship to a Catholic; and there, after long unbelief, he sees the people of England once more gathering to adore the LAMB That was slain. Every day adds to the number, until those who at first might be counted by units, find themselves surrounded by a multitude. "In that day ye shall know that I am in my FATHER, and ye in Me, and I in you." The work which GOD is accomplishing in England by the Catholic movement is the blessed Sacramental union of souls with Himself, and He calls us all, for His love's sake, to share its toils and its triumph with Him.

Positivism.

THE word "Positivism" is one, which requires explanation for most people. They may be more familiar than they are aware, in one way or another, with the thing implied by the word. But the word itself is a sound without meaning to many even of the educated, or with a meaning too vague and indistinct to be of any service. The ordinary associations of the word are not, at first sight, very pertinent. To be "positive," in the sense of being confident in opinion and tenacious of assertion, is hardly a distinctive peculiarity of any sect of philosophers. To be "positive" in the sense of not being negative, does not look like the mark of a philosophy, which, while professing to be most comprehensive, practically excludes from its notice so much of what is the common property of the human race. Perhaps the nearest approach of the ordinary sense of the word to the sense in which the positivist uses it, is when, in speaking of a "positive" command, we mean a command which we know to be a command simply because it is, and for no other reason; for Positivism professes to take things as they are, without troubling itself about recondite causes, and thus to build up a system of quasi-omniscience, by confining itself strictly to those things of which it imagines itself to be sure. Further consideration will show how far the name corresponds to the thing which it stands for, and whether Positivism deserves acceptance or rejection at the hands of those whose aim is the truth. The question is of the deepest and widest importance. Positivism claims to supersede the traditional belief of Christendom; it speaks of this as having lasted its time, as being now effete and obsolete, as merely stopping the way; and though avowed Positivism may be confined to very few in England as yet, the indirect influence of its principles tends to undermine received habits of thought in every direction. Before, however, proceeding to discuss its practical consequences, it is necessary to look the theory itself fairly and steadily in the face. The metaphysics of one generation, as Coleridge has said, become the ethics of the next, and the popular morality of that which comes after.

The inquiry, which we are instituting, must, if it is to be of

any use, be pursued dispassionately; for truth needs no favour; and whatever is not truth sooner or later confutes itself. It must be pursued from the philosopher's point of view, waiving for the moment the prescriptions of authority however sacred, if it is to carry conviction into quarters where those prescriptions are not recognized. It must be pursued so far as possible without the technical phrases which belong rather to the laboratory than the lecture-room; for it is quite possible to be exact without being pedantic. As for the details of Positivism, they may be left out of sight and out of mind, until it has been first ascertained how far the principles are true, in which they originate. Unless the foundations are sound, the superstructure, tall and stately though it may be, rising tier above tier with a superficial symmetry, must fall to the ground. If the very rudiments of the system involve a fallacy, we need not trouble ourselves much about its subsequent performances. It will save time and trouble in the end to begin at the beginning.

On the great fundamental principles which underlie, not merely this or that philosophy, but the very existence of man, and which the conditions of his existence compel him consciously or unconsciously to put to the proof daily, appeal may reasonably be made to the practical sense of mankind at large. All great truths, like the air which we breathe, or the light which warms and guides us, are essentially common. It is true indeed that communities as well as individuals err continually; but this happens, in both cases alike, when the judgment is warped either by the predilection of the feelings, or by defective knowledge of the particular object under its consideration. Galileo is persecuted, and Stephenson derided, not because the process of reasoning differs at different epochs, but because their cotemporaries have not yet learned the laws of the material universe, have not yet advanced so far as they in the sciences of astronomy and mechanics. Socrates must drink the hemlock, and Athanasius has the world against him, because their lofty teaching clashes with the lower propensities of human nature. But the blindness is transient; the error corrects itself; truth asserts its sovereignty. When the case has been fairly stated, its principles expressed clearly, and their application traced legitimately, the consentient voice of collective humanity is, to say the least, entitled to a hearing.

The philosopher in his closet is apt to forget this. His dreams must be confronted with the rude light of day, before they can take their place among realities, as the mental image of a substantial truth. If they fade away at the touch of daylight, they must be relegated, the sooner the better, to the world of phantoms,

as the spectral exhalations of an illusive consciousness. After all, the proof of every thing lies in the actual. Even the most abstract propositions must be verified by fact. From the contact of the mind with the external world, by the medium of sensation, they spring originally; and thither they return at last. It is the actual application, and nothing else, of the rule or the principle which gives it currency, and which establishes, so far as any thing in this life can be established, its validity and its practical certainty. Here only is the test in which the mind instinctively acquiesces; and, provided that the experiment be made on a commensurate scale, the test is a safe one. Expedience, for instance, if only we look far enough and widely enough into the network of consequences, invariably coincides with the true and the right. *Judicet orbis terrarum.* Let the world give its verdict. The appeal is made, not indeed to mere numbers, but to the corporate intelligence of the great family of man.

Positivism, in one sense, is no new thing. Its axiom, that we must start from what we know, and thence move onwards to that which we either know not at all or know less well, is as old as the time of Socrates, and older still. In fact, although philosophical systems have often developed themselves very inconsistently with it, this is the basis of all philosophy and of all knowledge whatever. Socrates taught it more explicitly than his precursors, and practised it more consistently. The keynote of his teaching is, that we must make each single step of our journey sure, if we hope to arrive at truth. Aristotle inculcated it as emphatically: indeed, in his strong grasp this, the only clue through the labyrinth of speculation, was held even more firmly, because he was more content than his master to abstain from those ethereal mazes where it could not avail him. He erred ludicrously in details of material science, though sometimes even there anticipating modern discoveries by the marvellous power, which is the birthright of genius, of imagining the whole from a part; but his method was the right method, and he was true to it. The fault was in the insufficiency of the data which lay within his reach, in the scantiness of the material phenomena from which he had to generalize. Bacon and Locke trod in the footprints of Aristotle, with a larger area of the material world open to their observation. All alike taught, that induction must precede deduction, if the latter is to be of any value. We must take particular instances one by one, and mark the several points in which they differ or agree[1], in order to extract the laws of their being. Analysis must

[1] This sense of the likeness or unlikeness, identity or non-identity of things, by which we affirm "This is that," or "This is not that," seems to

clear the way for synthesis, disintegration for construction. We must take our stand on what we know best, and make our footing sure there, before we can make one step with safety towards those dim regions which are more remote from our cognition. So far as this, the "New Philosophy," if not as old as the hills, is at least as old as the human faculties of thinking and judging; and what it has to tell us is barely more than a truism, though, like many other truisms, too often disregarded.

The difference so far between Comte and Aristotle, or Comte and Plato, is chiefly this. The old philosophy closes its researches with the confession, that the mind of man, unassisted by some direct revelation from a source external to itself, cannot fathom the mystery of the universe, cannot unriddle our strange and complex existence, cannot reconcile the jarring elements of our nature, cannot pretend to have caught more than the faintest glimmering of the answer which the inexorable Sphinx demands from each and all of mortal race as they pass beneath her stony gaze, cannot say why man finds himself where he is and what he is, cannot account for him or his surroundings. The new philosophy, on the other hand, has a system of its own, independent altogether of a revelation from without, which it propounds as amply sufficient for all our requirements.

Here we come to what is essentially distinctive of Positivism. In order to attain, if possible, this certainty, and to subjugate all things to his own unaided intellect, the positivist begins by excluding from his notice whatever does not, in his opinion, admit of demonstration. He professes to take things simply as they are. Practically, he refuses to recognize the existence of whatever has no visible and tangible phenomena to produce as its passport for admittance into his universe; as if a certainty could be attained thus, which cannot be attained in any other way. Mathematics of course are his starting point. For the first principles of mathematics can be demonstrated by an induction which we may call universal; and in the application of its first principles there is no possible risk of mistake, because the numerals which are its symbols are precise and invariable. In the language of logic, the major premiss—for example, that one and one are not one, but two—is verified by the universal sense of

be the ultimate point, beyond which the analysis of the mind cannot go; and to be, strictly speaking, the only real intuition that we have. It is the basis of the syllogizing, which, though unconsciously for the most part, always takes place in the act of reasoning: and it seems to be analogous to that sense of liking or disliking which is the primary form into which all the emotions may be resolved.

mankind, and from this are evolved all the ramifications of the science with certainty, because there is no possible ambiguity in the middle terms employed, no risk of their being inexact or equivocal. In mathematics the proposition is perceived in the concrete at first, and its terms remain immutable through all subsequent reasonings. But the positivist has nothing to say to sciences which are less definite, because more abstract in their nature. He closes the door peremptorily against logic, because it is concerned, not with things which can be seen and handled, but with the processes of thought. Metaphysic is even more abstract, and therefore even more to be regarded with suspicion. Withdrawing itself even further than logic from things tangible, it investigates, not the manner in which the mind works, but the very nature of the mind, and of all those impalpable attributes in which man differs from the brute. Sciences such as these can have no place in Positivism.

Comte was as jealous as Swedenborg himself of the intrusion of metaphysic within the pale of his theories. Both aimed at a certainty and an infallibility beyond what is accorded to man. The Swede argued from his own inner consciousness; the Frenchman from his own observation of things without. Each starts with the assumption, that he can achieve certainty for himself. Each in his own way rejects the mental sciences. Because the phenomena which belong to these sciences are immaterial; because they are less sharply defined, less easily grouped into system; because they cannot be adjusted into his scheme for re-arranging the universe, the positivist, like the mystic, puts them aside, and makes his calculation with more than half of the figures omitted. Yet, there is a voice within man which tells him, that the things which are seen are for a time, the things which are not seen are for ever.

There can be no room at all for a science of ethic or of theology in a system like this. The Greek philosophy bowed instinctively, though with an unconscious reverence, to the sense of duty[2], and through the dimness of its vision stretched forth its hands toward a deity more worthy of its homage than the fantastic denizens of Olympus. But such abstractions as those of GOD and of duty are not precise enough for the cosmology of Positivism. Comte can rebuke, as they deserve, the chemist and the botanist, who boast that they have found the cause, because they have found the law, of operation. But he will not allow that, by a just analogy, the law implies a lawgiver. The

[2] The frequent recurrence of δεῖ in Greek philosophy without explanation is remarkable.

idea of Deity transcends those limits within which the positivist flatters himself that he can know with certainty, and therefore it cannot be admitted. He will not take the trouble to deny with Voltaire, nor will he attempt to disprove, the existence of a GOD. He argues only that such a thing is not-proved, and therefore non-existent. Instead of the old *De non apparentibus, et de non existentibus eadem est ratio*, his motto is *De non procul dubio demonstratis et de non existentibus eadem est ratio.* He insists that a thing must be demonstrated for certain, before he can receive it.

But human nature, even in a positivist, requires something to which it may pay allegiance, and to which the sense of obligation may be attached. Man needs a "religion," in the oldest and truest sense of the word: he needs something, the restraint of which may control his conscious instability of purpose. The religion of the positivist is not a religion without a GOD; for that is impossible. But it is a religion with a nonentity, which it calls the Human Race, enthroned where the Christian sees Him, Who is perfect Wisdom and perfect Love. So the philosophy, which repudiates abstractions, bows its knee to a shapeless, lifeless abstraction, which, if it represents any thing at all, is but a ghastly impersonation of our own imperfections. With this idea of a GOD, the idea of duty is exploded; for duty involves responsibility to a superior being; and the word "ought," with all its associations, must be expunged from our vocabulary. The substitute is "Altruism." In place of that old-fashioned sense of responsibility which, even among heathens, made Aristides and Phocion what they were, and to which we owe not one Wellington only, but thousands like him, though less known to fame, we are exhorted to act as members of a great co-operative society, and to remember that we must seek the good of all, if we seek the good of each in particular. The very life is gone from devotion and self-sacrifice, when their object is that which is but another name for ourselves.

In truth, Positivism, with all its vaunted philanthropy, is a colossal selfishness. Professing to regard only what really is, it says practically—"I am, and there is none beside me." Men of generous hearts there may be among its ranks. What system or creed, however erroneous, is there, without such? But of the philosophy which we are considering the mainspring is self. That which animates and directs its speculations is confidence in self, distrust of all but self, impatience of authority external to itself, or superior to its own consciousness. In systems of philosophy, as in ordinary matters, we must look into the emotive part of our nature for the causes of error. The reasoning of the intellect goes straight to its mark with the rapidity and accuracy of a ball from

a catapult, if the object is fairly in view, provided that no gusts of passion cause it to swerve from its course. The intellect guides our reasonings, as the helm guides the ship through the water: but it is the hand of the helmsman which gives a tendency to this or that direction. The idolatry of self gives a wrong bias to "Positivism;" and the consequent fault in its reasonings is twofold; first, in excluding from its idea of the universe whatever is irreconcilable with itself; next, in supposing that, even with the help of this elimination, it can attain a greater degree of certainty than is possible to others.

There is a great fallacy in the word *nature* as used by the positivist: and the fallacy is countenanced by those who, in defending the truths of revelation, use the word *supernatural* when they should rather say *supermaterial*. The twin hemispheres of spirit and matter are alike integral parts of nature: but the positivist shuts his eyes to the world of spirit, because it cannot be coerced into his complete system of the universe. Yet, that world is as real as the other, although its phenomena are indemonstrable, because they are intangible. "There are more things in heaven and earth, than are dreamt of" in the philosophy of Positivism. The will of man, manifesting itself in his free agency, and the Divine Will, of which the will of man is an indication, are as truly facts, though facts of a different kind, as the star which Leverrier watches through his telescope, or the insect which Darwin places under his magnifying glass. The consciousness of freedom, which even a child experiences in every movement, and the consciousness of responsibility to a superior being, which even a savage is not altogether without, are facts which the philosopher must take into account, although they are too indistinct to be stereotyped into an arithmetical formula.

But we need not pause to consider how far the existence of the spiritual world can be proved by reason without revelation. If the revelation, which affirms it, is itself authenticated, it is enough. The positivist forgets that knowledge may be received through the ear as well as through the eye. Provided that its source be trustworthy, the faith which "cometh by hearing" is quite as reasonable as the faith which comes from our own observation. Every day of our lives we put faith in others as to matters beyond our own observation. This faith is reasonable or unreasonable as the person in whom we place it is worthy or not. The faith of a Christian in his LORD differs from this ordinary faith, not in kind, but in degree only. The stake is greater, for it is happiness now and for ever; but the act of believing is the same. The Christian reasons that he has in CHRIST One worthy of all credence, and

therefore believes. The positivist reasons that he may trust his own impressions or those of others like himself, and believes accordingly. It is the same method really in both cases. Analysis discloses attributes of holiness and power in the Person of CHRIST; which, induction shows, are never found in one who is merely man; and the superstructure of the Catholic Faith rests on this foundation. But the positivist rejects the supermaterial without further inquiry, because it transcends his comprehension.

The positivist aims at certainty. Does he attain it? One science only can claim to have attained it; and that is the science which more than any other holds itself aloof from those affections and interests which make the life of man what it is, and without which it would be indeed colourless and blank. Mathematics are certain, not because the mathematician reasons by a different method, but because the symbols which he uses are the only symbols which cannot vary in value and in meaning; and because a mathematical proposition is so entirely disconnected with our likings and dislikings, our motives of attraction or repulsion, that it is as undisturbed by them as the quicksilver in the barometer by a rise or fall of the funds on the stock exchange. Other sciences have words for their counters; language is the currency of thought: and our words, like our coins, in passing from hand to hand, are continually defaced by use, and imperceptibly passing from one gradation of meaning to another. Other sciences may be swayed by the prejudices of passion. Mathematics are certain; because they are free from these two causes of error; but mathematics cover only a very small portion of man's doing, and suffering, and being. Man is something more than a mere calculating machine. No class of men, as a rule, is less practical than the mere mathematician. Beyond the pale of mathematics there is demonstrable certainty nowhere. Astronomy approaches most nearly to it; and astronomy is most remote in its practical bearings on man. The further science recedes from pure mathematics, and the closer it draws to the real springs of man's destinies, his hopes and fears, his loves and hatred, the

"Quidquid agunt homines votum, timor, ira, voluptas,"

the more is the positivist under a necessity of abandoning certainty. Even in what are called "physical" sciences, loudly as they proclaim their superiority in accuracy to theology or metaphysics, we meet with variations as perplexing as the caprices of our English climate. Even there, in the language of one[3] well

[3] J. S. Mill. *Auguste Comte and Positivism*, pp. 36 and 61.

qualified to speak, we find only "empirical generalizations," only "materials for science." We find Comte himself, the great teacher of Positivism, arbitrarily assuming a chemical hypothesis, which subsequent experiments are said to have disproved, "in order to satisfy an instinctive predilection for order and harmony." We see theories and systems displacing and demolishing one another like dolls in a puppet-show. The "certainty" which Positivism has to offer to the Christian, is but a poor exchange for the moral certainties of his religion. The positivist is himself drifting on a shoreless ocean without chart or compass, excepting such as he can make for himself. He is trembling on the brink of the abyss, and clutches the tuft of grass which yields in his grasp, instead of accepting the hand which is stretched forth from Heaven to uphold him.

It is not to be denied, that the world of spirit, as the world of matter, may have laws of its own to which it is conformed, and to which it pays obedience. If the analogy from the sense implanted in man of order and harmony is worth any thing, so it is. But to say that these laws can be apprehended, is a very different thing. A hybrid term, half Greek, half Latin, has been invented. "Sociology," we are told, is a science by which the ever-changing habits and opinions of men may be referred to laws as immutable as those, according to which light follows darkness, or summer winter. Such a sequence of opinion there may be, clear as the day to Omniscience. But the causes at work, even without taking the eccentricities of the will into account, are too manifold for man to make them out. Those who argue that the formation of character depends on circumstances either within or without man, forget that in every moment of his career, he is shaping and determining them for himself. One of the strongest instances of his dependence on the external world, is the influence of soil and climate on the character of a people. But these very circumstances are themselves a result, as well as a cause. They are susceptible continually of modification, for better or worse, from industry and ingenuity, or from the sloth and incapacity of man.

We hear much now-a-days of averages. It is argued, that if we can only get together statistics enough, we have got the key to the laws which regulate the course of human actions. But, by all the principles of true induction, these averages are worthless, unless derived from observation which is at once exhaustive and discriminating. They must not be taken from an incomplete induction, nor from one which fails to distinguish among the various causes which are at work. Even if it can be proved that, under certain predisposing conditions, certain forms of vice

recur periodically with equal intensity in the history of the world, the responsibility of man remains where it was, unless his free-will can be got rid of. For the duty of each to do his utmost against the evil, remains the same, whether the effort is successful or not. It is enough for practical purposes, that, without the attempt to repress it, the evil would be still more rampant than it is; and even if this were not so, heathen philosophy as well as Christianity teaches, that the ἐνεργεία, not the ἔργον, the doing, not the thing done, the honest endeavour, not the success consummated, is what really concerns us. The practical inference from such statistics is, that there is an evil agency at work in the world, which cannot be counteracted without incessant vigilance.

The same principle applies to the estimation of character, whether in the individual or in communities. Praise or blame is due, not to the character as we find it absolutely and in itself, but relatively and in proportion to the advantages which were enjoyed, or the hindrances which were to be contended with. Allowance must be made for the force of hereditary temperament within, as well as of education and other associations without. The practical inference from averages and statistics on this point is, that it is not for man to judge his fellows, but for Omniscience alone.

In truth, the problems of "Sociology" are too complex and too intricate to be solved by "Positivism." The restless play of human passions makes them difficult enough, even without the insuperable difficulty of the human will. But the will multiplies the difficulty in a tenfold degree, because it defies analysis and baffles investigation. It is vain to prognosticate what course it will take. It can and does violate antecedent probabilities. Placed between two rival attractions, it does not of necessity gravitate towards that which is to all appearance the stronger; nor does it, like the ass in the fable between the two bundles of hay, stand unable to move because of the attraction being equal. It is true that a man's propensities have a reacting power, and that, as this or that propensity is encouraged, it gains strength for the future. But, after all, the will is rather their creator than their creature. In forming our habits we are insensibly forging fetters for the will; but the fetters, however strong, are not too strong to be broken. Every thing else in the organism of man may be surrendered to materialism[4]. The faculties of his mind

[4] The will of man differs from the will of brutes in this spontaneity and in consciousness.

may be mechanical in their operation, and thought may succeed thought by a law of association; but, as the wheel revolves, the will exercises its right of selection, adopting or rejecting as it pleases. The emotions of his heart may result from his bodily structure, from a subtle combination of the nervous fluid with other kindred elements; but, as each emotion in turn demands to be gratified, the will assents or refuses as it pleases. Experience may show how largely both the intellect and the affections depend on the health of the body; but it cannot and does not show, that either affections or intellect are the will itself. Though intimately connected with it, they are extraneous to it; they are, to borrow Plato's imagery, the horses that draw the chariot, not the charioteer who guides them. Materialism may claim all else. But that something which is the man himself, his personality, his incorporeal life, his volition, his soul, which uses at pleasure the ministry of all his faculties, which cannot altogether, if it would, shake off the sense of responsibility in using them, which in every thrill of its consciousness bears witness to itself that it is an emanation from eternity, has never yet been proved to be of the earth in its origin and nature. Laws of its own even this may have, but they are not to be deciphered by man[5].

The same argument applies with even more force to that manifestation of the Divine Will which we call Providence. Here again, unless our sense of order and harmony misleads us, there is law in all its perfection. But who shall dare to say that he has spanned the laws of Providence in all their breadth and length and height, has fathomed their depth, has comprehended the infinity of their bearings? A miracle is a miracle, a thing which man can simply "wonder" at, a thing beyond his power to contrive, even though proved to result from the ordinary laws of material nature, provided that these laws have been so controlled and harmonized as to concur in producing a particular event at a particular moment, as no devices of man could have brought it to pass. Again, a miracle is a miracle, if it results from a spiritual law counteracting and cancelling for the time a material law. In either case the thing is miraculous, although in perfect accordance with the laws by which the Omnipotent exercises His sway; and, although foreknown and foredoomed, not an abrupt and abnormal interference. The tender watchfulness of GOD over the special needs of His creatures, severally, is perfectly compatible

[5] The universal sense of free-agency which is expressed in "Sic volo, sic jubeo; stet pro ratione voluntas," is a stronger proof of personal existence than the well-known "Cogito, ergo sum," of Descartes.

with law; and any theory which involves negation of law is incompatible with His Prescience. These laws are not GOD, as the materialist persuades himself; nor are they above GOD, as Time and Space in the older Greek Mythology were above the Gods of Olympus: but they are, if our conceptions may be trusted, a part of the Divine economy by which the world is administered. In proportion as the will of man is in conformity with the Divine Will, it has power thus to control inanimate nature. In the perfect conformity of the Will of the SON of MAN to that of His Heavenly FATHER, we see this power displayed in all its fulness.

The objection of the positivist, that a miracle is contradictory to reason, is based, as usual, on his assumption that there are no laws in the universe but such as he can comprehend. *Non est*, he argues, *quia non explicitum*. So with regard to prayer. The objection is twofold; and much confusion arises, unless we are careful to distinguish the one from the other. There is the objection, that man's prayer is incompatible with GOD's foreknowledge; that it is unreasonable to pray concerning things which have been already determined in one way or the other. To this it is enough to reply, that the objection applies as much and as little to every one of our actions; and that the prayer is as truly a link of the predetermined course of events, as any thing else. The difficulty is also very much diminished, if we bear in mind that our conception of time may be only the consequence of our inability to think of events, which are really coexistent, otherwise than as successive.

But the objection of the positivist is rather, that events follow one another by an inherent order of their own, and that this order cannot be affected by any thing so irrelevant in his eyes as prayer. Here again is the assumption, as usual, that there is no Divine Being ready to hear prayer, that there is not

> "——a Divinity which shapes our ends,
> Rough hew them as we will."

It is false to say, that the Christian expects a miracle in reply to his prayer. A stone thrown from the hand obeys, primarily, the impulse given by the will, and obeys at the same time, secondarily, the material laws which regulate the muscular agency employed, and the motion or rest of a ponderable substance. Similarly, the overruling Will of Providence guides and governs the course of the storm or of the pestilence, not by violating the laws of matter, but by using their submissive instrumentality. He need not endeavour to explain how and by what *modus*

operandi prayer can affect the course of other things. It may be, that as earthly parents wait to be asked before giving, so the Heavenly FATHER would quicken in His children their love for Him. Anyhow, the duty of prayer follows inevitably from that sense of relation to a Superior Power of which the positivist takes no account. For a Christian there is, besides, the special command and the special promise of his Incarnate LORD.

The main argument of Positivism, as of all other neologies, is drawn from the progress of the human race. It is the same fallacy again. Concentrating his attention on the huge strides of that knowledge, which relates to the material world, the positivist will not see, that in other respects man remains essentially the same, although

"—the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change."

True, man is no plant vegetating for ages on the same spot and in the same way. There is a progress. Every year sees more and more of the material world reclaimed from darkness and chaos and subjected to the intellect of man, just as fen and common are every year enclosed, drained, and broken up by the plough. But the progress is only here; although it may seem to a superficial observer to extend to other things. The change of opinion, for example, on the subject of witchcraft is simply because men have discovered, that results, which in their ignorance of "physical" science they attributed to other causes, are really due to causes of a material kind. The change of feeling, again, on the subject of persecution, is simply because experience has taught men, that they cannot attain their end by those means. The change which history discloses, is in the adjuncts and circumstances with which man is environed, not in himself; it is in the scenery of the play, not in its *personæ*. As the great drama of life unrolls itself slowly to its consummation, man, the chief actor, in it preserves his individuality to the end—

"Qualis ab incepto processerit et sibi constat."

In all its marvellous discoveries the intellect plays the part of a servant, not of a master; it is an implement, not the hand of the pioneer which wields it. Civilization may seem to effect a great change in man: but the unlikeness between the civilized and the uncivilized man is on the surface; the likeness is deep and at the core. Those who say[6] that Watt and Stephenson have effected

[6] Lecky's *History of Rationalism.*

a revolution in man, confound his external aids and appliances with his real inner life.

"One touch of nature makes the world akin."

The philosopher of the nineteenth century is after all, as the life of such men as Comte shows, not very different from his fellow-men of very different condition. Cæsar Borgia and the costermonger who murders his wretched paramour, though separated by a gulf of years, are at heart the same. The African squaws who ministered so lovingly to the sickness of Mungo Park, felt the same pity for the helpless as the gentle ladies who went to the Crimean hospitals with Florence Nightingale.

There are few plainer lessons in history than this; that the good and wise of every age resemble one another, and, in like manner the wicked and foolish. When Comte speaks of mankind as having passed through, first, a "theological" and then a "metaphysical" stage, before crowning their "progress" with his "Positivism," he regards mankind from a material point of view. So far as that goes, he is right. While ignorant of material laws, men were apt to refer every thing, first to the arbitrary interposition of some deity, and, afterwards, to the force of some idea. In any other sense, his words have no meaning; for they speak of things as successive which are really going on at once; they imply an imaginary demarcation between conditions of society and habits of thought, which are really blended together. But there are few things easier, especially to a French philosopher, than to construct any number of theories of history. If facts stand in the way, so much the worse for them. Comte speaks of an upward progress from the worship of Fetish to that of deified men. Where are the instances? History speaks rather of a gradual declension, as in Greece and Rome, from a higher and purer worship. In the pages of Juvenal and Tacitus, and in the profligacies which are there unveiled, we see that mere civilization by itself is no better security against utter degradation, than the rude life of the savage in his primeval forests. Left to itself, and without the renovating influences of Revelation, the progress of mankind, as history shows, is not onwards to perfection, but tends to revert to the very evils which it seems to have left far behind in the past. History is apt to repeat itself. But his idea of progress is indispensable to Comte's theory.

It would be tedious to follow Positivism into its full development. Inconsistent as this may seem with its first principles, it is in one sense their legitimate issue. For it is the fate of error to complete its circle, and to end by contradicting

the very principles from which it started. So, not unfrequently, the man who will not believe the Evangelists, can believe any thing however preposterous, that comes to him in the shape of "spirit-rapping" or "table-turning:" so, very often, the man who begins with the severest spiritualism ends by embracing materialism in its grossest form. Positivism begins by discarding psychology; it ends by embracing the guesswork of phrenology instead. It begins by mapping out the universe of thought into departments each duly squared and labelled; it ends by merging them all in the confusion of mysticism. It begins by restricting itself to the visible and the tangible; it ends by raving of an Anima Mundi and the Loves of the Planets. It begins by rejecting whatever cannot be demonstrated; it ends by affirming a proposition to be true because it is symmetrical and edifying. It begins by preaching unchecked licence of speculation; it ends by handing over the rest of mankind to the irresponsible despotism of a philosophical clique. It begins by renouncing GOD; it ends by preferring a Fetish to Him. Is this progress? Is it not rather a retrogression and relapse into that darkness and shadow of death, from which One came down from Heaven to set men free?

Positivism promises to reconstitute society, and remodel the politics of the world. Its founder predicted that all this should be done within some twenty or thirty years from its inauguration. The world is to be governed henceforth by philosophers; a new calendar is to supersede that which Europe has used for ages; and a septimal coinage is to be adopted universally because of some mystic excellence in the number seven. Some, if not Comte himself, will add, that woman is to be transplanted from the domestic retirement whence her gentle influence insensibly radiates over the world, to the glare and turmoil of public life. In short, the "Cloudcuckooland" of Athenian burlesque is realized at last. Positivism undertakes to regenerate the world,

> "——sese attollit in auras,
> Ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit."

Babel menaces heaven; but it is in vain that the builders pile stone on stone in the frantic expectation of scaling it. The image, as in the great king's dream, towers from the plain; but its feet are only of perishable clay, and fall it must.

As we have seen, Positivism has a religion ready, as well as a system of philosophy and of politics. For the void which it creates must be filled up somehow. It provides new priests, new sacra-

ments, a new worship. For prayer it substitutes "effusion," or reverie: for that "resurrection to life eternal," which is the "sure and certain hope" of Christians, it holds out the chance of "living in the remembrance" of survivors; in place of that Triune Deity, Whom Christendom adores, it worships Humanity, Earth, and Space. The parody is complete. The parhelion is a mockery of the true sun. Man asks for bread, and the positivist gives him ashes.

It is in France that the evil expands itself most exuberantly. The passion for precision and minuteness of regulation is gratified by a system which professes to explain every thing. Each turn and twist in the mental kaleidoscope presents to the eye new combinations, each more ingenious than the last; and though it may prove in the end to be merely an optical illusion, for the time there is the charm of novelty, and the still greater fascination of symmetry and completeness. There is less danger of Positivism thriving in English soil, as a whole. There is not the same sublime disregard of facts, when they stand in the way of a theory; not the same idolatry of method here. But tendencies akin to Positivism are at work among us. For "the world is waxing old;" and there is that in "Positivism" which approves itself at first sight to the temperament of old age. The cardinal principle of Positivism, as we have seen, is to take things as they are. This is the flag under which it fights, at least in theory. While the optimist affirms that things are best as they are; the fatalist, that they must be as they are; and the mere dogmatist, that they are because they are; the positivist confines himself to saying that they are as they are. He avoids the question of causation, and the question of a morally better or worse. Now the habit of mind which Positivism thus expresses, is exactly what suits the old age of the world. As with the race, so it is with the individual. As time goes on, and the hair is streaked with grey, experience brings disappointment, disappointment brings patience, and the fervid enthusiasm of youth is apt to subside into an apathy, if not of contentment, yet of acquiescence. The lawyer will not waste his energies on points not directly bearing on his brief. The statesman accepts the inevitable compromises which practice exacts from theory. The controversialist is satisfied if he can throw the burden of proving on his opponent. The pride of indifferentism retires into itself from the clamour of tongues. "Things are as they are." The jaded spirit takes refuge from the violence and acerbity of the strife in words like these, as France, exhausted by the schemes of wrangling visionaries, prostrates herself at the feet of a dictator.

Who can deny that something, which in this way answers practically to scientific Positivism, shows itself in the literature of the day? The influence of men like Arnold and Coleridge, who, whatever else they were, were certainly anti-positivist, is giving place to influences of a less earnest, less uncompromising kind. Goethe may fairly be taken as representative of this school, with which the external restrictions of right and wrong are nothing, if they seem to interfere with the free development of human nature as it is. The habit of taking things as they are, without reference to an unswerving law imposed from above, intrudes from the material sciences into questions of ethic and of religion. History is studied, not as the battle-field of good and evil, but as exhibiting certain irresistible tendencies, which, whether good or bad, must have their way. Writers like Carlyle talk of "eternal truth;" but practically they take the personages whom they choose for their heroes as the real canon of right and wrong. It is the fashion to be cosmopolite; but in stripping himself of narrow local prejudices, the cosmopolite too often casts away much that he ought to cherish. The most popular periodicals are those whose line it is, while keeping higher questions of principle in the background, to insist mainly on what is convenient for the moment. The most popular novels are animated by the same spirit; and a clever novel more than any thing else is a faithful mirror of the habits and feelings of the day. Thackeray's sympathies were on the whole with what is right and good: and yet all his humour and pathos are instinct with the sentiment, though he owns it with a sigh, that human nature is as it is, must take its course, must have its fling. *Adam Bede* and *The Mill on the Floss* are exquisite photographs of life as it is; but they fail to remind us that it ought to be better than it is, and that our evil propensities must be disciplined into subjection to the good. It is needless to accumulate instances. This practical deification of human nature, not as it should be, but as it is, is a characteristic danger of our time. Unchecked, it cannot but end in substituting for the

"Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,"

of which our great poet sings, an utter selfishness disguised in the exaltation of humanity at large.

How is the evil to be met? The bane indicates the antidote. Every error is the perversion of a truth; and the perversion points to the truth by which it must be corrected. Side by

side with this New Religion stands the great institution, unchanged amid the vicissitudes of ages, which deduces its origin from no speculations of man's finite intellect, but from the teaching of ONE Who has proved Himself to be the Incarnation of Deity [7].

The Institution of which we speak does not, like Positivism, invite its votaries by a promise of omniscience, but it sheds light enough to guide their footsteps from the cradle to the grave. It does not, like Positivism, proffer an Utopian felicity in this life, but, while showing how much even of temporal evil may be healed, and how the curse which remains may be converted into a blessing by endurance, it fixes its stedfast gaze on that great Hereafter, which Positivism shrinks from contemplating; and, while Positivism declaims and theorizes, it is incessantly at work to ameliorate the lot of man. It does not, like Positivism, profess to be demonstrated like a theorem in Euclid, but it has in itself a concurrence of practical evidences, which is more than enough for those who do not close their hearts and minds against it. It does not, like Positivism, profess to account for every thing; but it does account, as nothing else can, for the strange inadequacies and incongruities of man's earthly career, by showing that it is only the rehearsal in time of the part which he must play in eternity. It does not, like Positivism, present to the superficial glance a perfect symmetry of outline and proportion; and yet, as in those old Gothic cathedrals which have been called the "petrifaction" of our religion, there is a latent symmetry, a mutual interdependence of all its parts, which grows on the beholder continually. It is based, more truly than any merely human creed, on those principles of induction which satisfy the philosopher; but it can approve itself practically to all, learned and unlearned too. It is no system, for those who crave for an artificial completeness and precision; and yet, it has seen system after system of human manufacture crumble into dust as though they had never been, and swept from the earth like castles which children make with cards, while its own weather-stained walls are proof against the storms of ages, because they are built upon the Rock. It is the Church which the hands of the Apostles have reared on the Divine LORD, Who is its corner-stone.

But the evil must be met, as always, by careful and patient discrimination. In every system, however false, there is yet the

[7] The positivist forgets how largely the atmosphere which he breathes is impregnated with Christianity, and that the very "Altruism" on which he prides himself would have been, in its truest sense, simply inconceivable without that.

utterance of needs, which the truth only can satisfy; there are germs of good to be fostered into a healthy maturity; they are tendencies which, dangerous as they are, may be directed into other channels. Positivism cannot be counteracted by the unreasoning dogmatism, which is, in one sense, its provocative and its cause: indeed Positivism is itself another form of that yearning for infallible certitude, which requires every letter of Holy Scripture to be certified by Divine Authority. Every science has its borderland, a region of twilight, where judgment must be suspended, and theology more than other sciences, because it lies on the very confines of knowledge forbidden to man. The theologian must beware of venturing too near the limits which Divine Providence, overruling the Creeds of the Church, has marked out for him. He must not presume to define, on such subjects as that of inspiration, or of a future state, or of the immutability beyond this life of human ideas of morality, or on the mode of CHRIST'S Presence in the Church, or, in short, on any mystery whatever, more than the HOLY SPIRIT has willed to reveal to His Church, in other words, more than is needful for man. There is a Christian sense as well as an anti-christian sense in the axiom of the positivist, that we must take things as they are. They embody that spirit of resignation in which man must wait for more perfect knowledge until the day shall come "for all things to be revealed," when he shall "know even as he is known." They remind us of that great truth, old as the Athenian philosophy, often neglected now, by positivists and by transcendentalists alike, that the highest knowledge possible for man in this life is only of things in their relation to ourselves, not in their essential being, of phenomena not of realities. With regard to things practically beyond his reach, the Christian must act, as the positivist unreasonably does with regard to things beyond his power of demonstrating; he must leave them on one side for the present.

The Catholic Church can alone satisfy those aspirations after an imaginary good, which have seduced to Positivism adherents worthy of a better cause. Here they may find that true comprehensiveness which would gather all sorts and conditions of men into its bosom; and which, though sometimes distorted by misinterpretation, can adapt itself to all the varying wants of humanity. Here they may find that reverence for whatever there is of good in the past or the distant, which gathers up and assimilates to itself, "that nothing be lost," the scattered fragments of truth. Here they may find, if they will look through the idiosyncrasies of particular schools and mark well the beating of the great heart

of the Church, that true philanthropy, that heroic abnegation of self, which they desire. The human messenger who delivers the message of the Gospel, may sometimes degrade it into the language of mere self-preservation. But a deeper insight sees that the prudence which the Gospel inculcates is only the means to the end, a necessary step towards the fulfilment of yet higher duties. If the positivist longs for the full and free development of man's corporeal endowments, "the sound mind in the sound body," in Christianity more emphatically than elsewhere, is recognized the dignity of the body as being a "servant unto righteousness," "the temple of the HOLY GHOST," the sharer in a glorified immortality. The Church, like its great Apostle, becomes "all things to all men." Unflinching in the assertion of the great doctrinal verities, which are the charter of its inheritance, it yet presents these doctrines in such manner as best to penetrate the heart. It is the divorce of practice from doctrine, of morality from theology, of reason from faith, which more than any thing else hinders the universal reception of the Truth. It is in the practical appeal which He makes so pleadingly to man, through all which is dear to man in himself or in others, that the Voice of the SAVIOUR pierces the heart. "Apud philosophos," says one himself foremost among philosophers, "multa sunt acutè dicta et leniter calentia, sed in iis omnibus hoc non invenio; Venite ad Me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis, et Ego vobis requiem præbebo."

"There is no GOD, the foolish saith,
But none, there is no sorrow;
And nature oft the cry of faith
In bitter need will borrow:
Eyes which the preacher could not school
By wayside graves are raised,
And lips say 'GOD be pitiful!'
Which ne'er said 'GOD be praised!'"

I. GREGORY SMITH.

Revelation and Science: Two Interpreters of the Will of God.

It is a simple matter of unmistakable fact, that it has pleased God to make known His will, so far as it is His pleasure that it should be understood by men, in two different ways. First, there is the record of God's works, in which He has written the history of the world and of the processes by which it has arrived at its present state, in characters which may be misunderstood, but which nevertheless must, in themselves, be absolutely true. And secondly, there is the record of God's word, in which He has been pleased to supplement the testimony of His works by certain declarations of His will and purposes both in the past and in the future, in matters which could not, from their nature, be revealed to man by any of His material works. Both these records need interpretation; and they can only be interpreted by the use of special faculties which have been given for the purpose. For the most part, these witnesses of God's presence in His world, being concerned with different subject matter, run on lines parallel to one another, so that either can be followed out to its full extent without any reference to the other. But in some few places it is not so. Here and there are words of Revelation which declare not only spiritual, but material truth; which are concerned not only with the purposes of God in the destinies of man, but with that which has been His will in the creation of the world; which present, as it were, short crossing lines forming a point of junction between the word and works of God, so that the class of truths which may be elicited from the latter, are distinctly declared to us in the former.

Thus, we recognize two distinct means by which it has pleased God to declare Himself to man. We recognize His works to be as truly a declaration of His will as is His word. We recognize also, that both His works and His word need interpretation; and that these interpretations can only come from the exercise of our faculties: in the one case, presenting the sum of their conclusions, under the name of Science, to be weighed and tested by our own intellects; in the other, to be simply received under the name of Faith. And when we speak of comparing the two, it is to ascertain how far, when they are clearly and decidedly distinct,

they do run in lines exactly parallel, thus manifestly leading up to the same idea of GOD; and how far, when they both speak on the same subject, they speak with the same utterance, thus not only leading up to one idea of GOD, but declaring themselves to have been both sent by Him in their proclamation of the same truth. This unanimity of witness we may assume to be a decisive proof, that both the conclusions of the human intellect from the works of GOD, the sum of which we call Science, and Revelation which assumes to be an immediate declaration of His will, are exactly what they claim to be, each in its separate way an authorized interpreter of His purposes. Whereas any great discrepancies between the two tend to prove, either that the conclusions of the human intellect on certain points are fallacies and mistakes, or that Revelation is not that which it claims to be, a declaration of truth, not only as a matter of fact free from error, but, in its essence infallible, as coming immediately from GOD.

Now, in comparing any number of things together, whether physical or intellectual, in order to ascertain their true value, the first step is always to estimate the exact worth of each, to reduce them, as it were, to common terms, to find the elements in each which are capable of comparison, by eliminating from each of them that which is not essentially a portion of their nature. Thus, in one case, we compare the coins of different countries by separating the alloy with which they are mixed, and comparing the results of the assay, the value of the precious metals which they contain. Thus, in another, we form our judgment of the customs and habits and ways of life of different nations, by mentally eliminating the mere outward differences, of language and habit and position, and endeavouring to estimate the truth and honesty and manliness, or their contraries, which these outward fashions indicate as lying at the heart of the national life. In all cases, whether the value of physical bodies, or mental ideas are to be compared, there is some process of the kind to be gone through, a stripping off husks, or chipping off incrustations, that we may arrive at the inner verity, and the true essence of the things themselves.

Therefore, at the outset of our present inquiry, it must be remembered that both Science and Revelation simply mean knowledge: in the one case, knowledge arrived at by the exercise of the human intellect on certain subjects; in the other, knowledge delivered immediately from GOD on subjects not lying within the range of any exercise of the human intellect. In both cases, knowledge; in both cases, knowledge derived from GOD: but in the one case, unfolded gradually from His works to

the intellectual faculties; in the other, revealed at once, in a lesser degree to the intellectual faculties, but especially to faith. In the one case, the office of the intellectual faculties is to evolve a revelation for themselves from certain data; in the other, it is simply to understand, and thus to accept a revelation which has been already made.

Thus, then, Science and Revelation are both knowledge in the strictest meaning of the word; and the difference between them mainly consists in the different subject with which they deal, and the different modes by which it is acquired. Science, to take it first, is knowledge of facts which lie within the grasp of human comprehension, and of the causes which are of necessity implied in the existence of the facts; it is the sum of human experience, the total of that which human intellect can grasp of things lying around it in the present.

But it must be borne in mind, while thus admitting to the full the claims of Science, that there is also a great mass of ideas confusedly heaped together in the popular acceptation of the meaning of the word, which have no claim whatever to be covered by it. In fact, there are few expressions more vague, at least in their common use, than "Scientific truth," or the "Facts of science." For these expressions are often used to cover a number of ideas to which in no way can they be properly applied; as for instance, when we hear of facts which are assumed to be so on very insufficient evidence, or which confuse attempted explanations, with the realities themselves; or of laws, which are either mere dogmatism, or a confusion of the knowledge of phenomena with the knowledge of facts, or the results of a substitution of the immediate and secondary causes which lie within the reach of human experience and human reasoning, for those higher causes which lie far above the region where human experience gleans, one by one, the treasures of which it boasts so highly.

And this is ever apparent in the proclamations of Science concerning itself. Take, for example, a case in which a theory has been unconsciously substituted for an ascertained fact. Hitherto, it has always been assumed that river beds are caused by the erosion of water ever eating out the hard rock through which it flows; and calculations founded on this supposed fact, have always taken their place among those by which the duration of the existence of the present earth is sought to be approximately ascertained. Yet, it now seems likely that this will soon be placed in the list, if not of fallacies, yet of facts so very variable in their operations, that they can never be safely accepted

as a basis either of reasoning or of calculation. Sir Roderick Murchison, in his speech at Birmingham, speaks very plainly concerning this, in a certain instance. "I do not apprehend," he says, "that those who have examined the tract of Coalbrook Dale, will contend that the deep gorge in which the Severn there flows, has been eaten out by the agency of that river; the more so when we see the abrupt severance which has taken place between the rocks which occupy its opposite sides. In that part of Shropshire, the Severn has not worn away its rocks during the historic era, nor has it produced a deeper channel, whilst in its lower parts it has only deposited silt and mud, and increased the extent of land upon its banks."

This, as we have said, is an instance of a theory being mistaken for a fact. Here is another case, in which a hasty generalization has been substituted for a logical deduction. For the fact of certain implements having been found among the gravel strata, in close proximity to the bones of certain animals said to have become extinct in very remote periods, has been held to prove these two assumptions:—First, that the fellowship in which these implements are found, proves that the makers of them existed in periods long antecedent to those in which we have any data to aid our calculations: and, Secondly, that the makers of these implements must have been human beings. Now the first of these opinions seems simply to take for granted a certain proposition which requires to be proved; while the other is only a logical possibility, not a necessary consequence from the same premises. In the absence of any certain proof as to the date of the extinction of these animals, it seems as reasonable to infer, from the company in which they are found, that in some cases they lingered on earth longer than has been believed, as that man must have existed on earth in periods long before those in which he is usually supposed to have appeared. But secondly, it is clearly an illogical assumption rather than a result of sound reasoning, to assert that the existence of these flint implements implies, of necessity, the existence of man. The utmost that they prove, if we distinguish argumentative proof from probable conjecture, is the existence of an animal endowed with sufficient capacity to form them; and it may be also fairly added, to put them to some useful purpose. It is not logical to assume that the animal must have been man, simply because man, in our own times, is the only animal that can produce them. The *differentia* of man is not a capacity to produce flint implements, but the faculty of conscious reasoning, moral powers, and, above all, the glorious mystery of immortality. All that can be proved from these im-

plements, is the existence at an uncertain period, of a being endowed with sufficient capacity to make them and to use them. That such a being existed, we are not careful to assert. All that we have ventured to point out is this—the illogical assumption of those who declare, that man could only have produced these implements, that man could only have produced them at certain mythical periods of the earth's duration. The hypothetical being may possibly have been a higher form of ape, with powers of instinct drawing nearer to that subtle line which separates instinct from reason. But there is absolutely no reason for the assertion that it must have been identical with that being, with his grand and ever-developing endowments, with his high moral capacities, and with his gift of immortality, which we recognize as man. And to argue up to the necessary existence of the capacities which constitute the *differentia* of humanity from such grounds as these, is not more reasonable than it would be to use the same argument from a bird's nest as implying the presence of constructive power, or from the cell of the bee, as proving the existence of the mathematical faculty; or to assert that the gift of human reason, as exerted in a reasonable use of things, is exhibited when the ape employs a staff to steady his steps, or the elephant uses a leafy branch as a fan to defend him from the flies, or the thrush, with a hard snail-shell in her beak, puts the biggest stone in the garden walk to the purpose of a blacksmith's anvil.

But we need not dwell at greater length on this; for none will be more ready than the true student of science, the seeker, in Newton's spirit, after truth, to admit the imperfections, and fallacies, and errors which are comprised in that great field of knowledge, perfect and imperfect, which is usually called "scientific truth." None more surely know than he who can best explain the fallacies and deceptions of the senses,—who can say by what illusion of the faculties it comes to pass that the thirsty traveller rushes, in vain haste, to the mirage in the desert, or the sailor sees visionary ships in the far-off horizon, or the nerves of the student overstrung with labour and excitement, will throw out visionary music, as of notes struck on fairy harpstrings, or of bells chiming sweet music far away,—how continually the evidence of the senses needs correcting, how false and unreal are many of the conclusions to which they point with most apparent certainty. None will know better than he who has given the most thought to the results of science, that absolute certainty is most hard to attain in scientific matters, simply because the means of arriving at truth, the human faculties,

are such imperfect instruments, that the results they give ever need to be corrected by fresh observations, and tried by new tests. And above all, none will own more freely than he who has gauged most perfectly the depths of scientific knowledge, how very shallow these depths really are; how very little below the surface the plummet of human investigation has sunk down into the great deep; how, after all, the science of which we speak so much, is but a record of certain phenomena, or the sum of the experience of man, the record of phenomena but partially observed and still more partially understood, the imperfect sum of an imperfect experience. So, at least, says one of our most distinguished men, Professor Acland, speaking in well-weighed words to the very crown and flower of English science:—"Yet are we only on the threshold of detailed knowledge, we still speak of many hard points with an almost childish simplicity. What do we understand, for instance, of the cause of that which Herbert Spencer calls 'Organic Polarity,' that is to say, the power, force, or tendency by which lost parts are repaired, by which a whole limb, a part of a limb, or even all but a whole body is replaced by the outgrowth of what remains of the original humiliated whole, a process so common in Asteriadæ and Crustaceæ, and other animals, as to seem a matter of course in their history, while it is apparently a property which cannot exist in the higher animals? What do we know of the causes of hereditary transmission in general (a property wholly different from, and more unintelligible than the hypothesis of natural selection), or of the transmission of disease in particular, as for example, of Carcinoma?"

And this same caution is equally necessary when we speak of Revelation. Here too we must be very careful that we are not covering too much by the word, that we are not taking up ground which is clearly indefensible, because without the limits of the position. For it must be remembered, that the most comprehensive and dogmatic assertion of the inspiration of the words of Revelation, does not imply any assertion of *inspiration given to those who are its interpreters*, so that their interpretations are to be received as absolute and infallible truth. It is therefore possible that many things which we hastily include under the title "Truths of Revelation," may be merely probable interpretations of Revelation; that we may be mistaking descriptions of phenomena for revelations of the causes which underlie phenomena, or bringing in unauthorized traditions and glosses of human intellect upon the words of revelation, and mingling them in a confused idea of that which we call truth. For in-

stance, to take the old familiar example, there was a time when it was counted heresy to believe that the Word of GOD did not intend to declare as a fact, that the sun went round and the world stood still. Or, in much later times, it was a part of the belief of many persons that Holy Scripture described death as passing upon animals as well as man, as the consequence of Adam's sin. Yet, when it was established as an undoubted fact, that death had been the law of animal life in ages long antecedent to that in which man appeared upon the face of earth, then it became clear that this belief was merely a poetic image substituted for a truth of Revelation; that it was Milton and not Moses in whom people were believing; that if Adam did not know what death was, the warning of the Creator—"Thou shalt not die," would have been simply unintelligible; and that if we accept as a truth that "in Adam all die," animals as well as man, then, since "*as* in Adam all die, *so* in CHRIST shall all be made alive," we come at once to the belief of the "simple Indian" who trusts that his dog and horse shall bear him company in the life beyond the grave.

But it is unnecessary to illustrate this further, for no Churchman will be likely to extenuate the difficulty of arriving at absolute truth in the wide field of subjects in which the Church speaks with no authoritative voice. The more earnest he is in his endeavours to arrive at the meaning of the mind of GOD as mirrored in Revelation, the more clearly he will see how truth is like the rain-drop, which, issuing pure and undefiled from its birthplace in the sky, before it reaches the abode of men, is mingled with other elements, and holds in solution other substances, as if absorbed into it of necessity even on its passage through the atmosphere, and much more on its contact with the earth; and so, discovering how much of a human element mingles imperceptibly with his own conception of divine truth, he will be thankful if the patient thought of others can help him in any way to attain to clearer and to truer ideas, to see truth through a better medium more certainly and distinctly as it is. And thus, so far, in any process which implies the idea of comparing Science with Revelation, it must be borne in mind, *that we have but to compare the certainties of each, the knowledge, in the strict sense of the term, which is given us in God's works, with that which is given us in God's word.*

Having thus reduced both Science and Revelation to their primary element of knowledge, we shall be better prepared to estimate the aspect in which each will appear when viewed from the

stand-point of the other. And to express this we shall use, as convenient symbols, the words "Churchman," and "Man of Science," not as implying any opposition, but simply as representing the results of the use of intellect on the one hand and faith on the other, as exercised upon the various problems that lie around the life of man. First then, admitting the fact that there is a field of knowledge of the will and purposes of GOD lying beyond the boundaries of those mysteries which are revealed once for all, and which are not to be comprehended by the intellect, but to be believed by faith, the Churchman will be prepared to recognize the office of Science in the interpretation of the will of GOD. For the Church, to which is given the highest office in His household, is not the only one of GOD'S servants doing His work here on earth. As in our LORD'S parable, there are many servants in His household, to each of whom He has given a special work, to each of whom He has given special faculties, that the work may be rightly done. And it is only by freely recognizing this great truth, and by accepting the other servants in the household as commissioned in their several tasks by the common Master of them all, that the Church can perform her own work aright, or take her proper place as the head and steward of all, ruling and correcting them, yet not interfering with their proper tasks; or, to take another comparison, filling that office which perhaps is pointed out in the task specially given to one servant in the parable, "He commanded the porter to watch."

This principle indeed is readily and freely conceded, as clearly a result of experience in one branch of Science, and in one portion of Revelation. History is always accepted as the true interpreter of prophecy, or rather history and prophecy are found to be mutual interpreters of the truths made known by each: history, enabling us to understand the symbols of prophecy, and confirming it by most sure evidence as the Word of GOD; prophecy, interpreting all history as a continuous record of GOD'S dealings with His creatures, putting the golden clue into our hands which runs through all its intricate, and, to the unaided sight, dark and unintelligible mazes, aiding us to put together the broken fragments in which men have rescued the old records of their own existence out of the darkness of the past, making the dry bones come together, and stand upon their feet, that, quickened with a new life, they may speak with articulate and intelligible voice of the plan and purpose of GOD. And in the same relation in which history stands to prophecy does Physical Science stand to those portions of Revelation which pass into the domain of the material creation. Here, Science

stands by the side of Revelation, not as a mute Eastern slave, with bowed-down head and sealed lips, prostrated in unworthy adoration, but as a sage, standing reverently in presence of one who is a sovereign mightier than he, yet like him, a servant whose lordship has been delegated by the same Master, and interpreting evermore, in virtue of his office, the secret handwriting and mysterious symbols graven by the Master's hand on the walls of His own palace, in which He has bidden them to dwell.

And indeed, practically, the Church Catholic has been ever guided to act on this rule. For thus, while claiming and exercising authoritatively her sovereignty on matters of faith, settling by dogmatic interpretations the definitions of Divine truth, she has left the words which touch upon those physical facts, a knowledge of which may be attained by other faculties than faith, to be interpreted by those faculties themselves, treating them as lying out of her own domain, beyond the limits of her special charge. And it may be noted that where any portion of the Catholic Church has attempted to speak, as with authority, on subjects such as these, there has usually been some error mingled with such decisions; as if, having transgressed the limits of its sovereignty, the guidance of the higher Wisdom had ceased.

Thus, then, the Churchman, being prepared to recognize reason as one of the great faculties given by GOD to man, to be used in His service, and for His honour and glory, as truly as the faculty of faith itself, will be ready to receive the legitimate results of human reason when exercised on legitimate subjects, as hermeneutic expositions coming from an *authorized* though not an *infallible* interpreter. He will not hesitate to scrutinize very closely his own conceptions of the truth, as revealed in those portions of Revelation which Science claims as capable of interpretation by human intellect, and which the Church seems to have given up to such interpretation; nor will he be startled if he finds that, in some places, he has been unconsciously substituting human theories and human opinions for the real declarations of the Word. Thus, to go back to a former illustration, while distinctly upholding the divine truth of Revelation, truth in itself as pure as the rain when it drops from the sky, he will also allow that Science may fill the office of a chemical agent cast into a stream, freeing it from the impurities it has contracted, and the foreign substances it has absorbed, and restoring it to the original purity and clearness with which it came of old direct from Heaven upon earth. And if there are still difficulties hard to be understood, problems which appear to indicate different solutions to Science and to Revelation, then faith will come

in as the reconciler of the two interpreters, admitting fully the authority of each; showing that the apparent discrepancy is simply owing to the imperfection of the medium through which the interpretation comes, as the same stick will appear straight in the portion which is viewed through the medium of the air crooked in that part which is seen through the medium of the water; and content to wait, quiet and secure, till a keener vision shall make all things clear, and a more perfect knowledge shall make all things plain.

So far from the stand-point of the Churchman contemplating the office of Science. We have now to take up the position of the Man of Science, as looking upon that which is presented to him as an authoritative Revelation from GOD. And in so doing he will remember that the object of Revelation is to inform mankind of those portions of the will of the Almighty, and those only, which cannot be apprehended by the intellectual faculties. And thus he will not expect to find any thing declared in Revelation to be received by faith, which he could have discovered by the due employment of his reason on the material which is allotted for its exercise. Nor is it an answer to this rule, to allege that the historical parts of Scripture merely contain information which might have been, and in some cases actually is, contained in ancient records; because they disclose something which man could not have discovered for himself, as they show the determinate will and purpose of the Almighty underlying the chain of secondary causes, and ordering all the sequence of events so that each one should fall into its own place, as an efficient in one great work, a portion of one mighty plan. If it were not for the historical parts of Scripture, we could scarcely read intelligently, or with an understanding of its real meaning and significance, any history at all; much less could we have understood that the clue to all its mazes is in the predestined mystery of the Incarnation, and that all ancient history is but the preparation of the world by His eternal Wisdom for this, the central truth on which all history turns.

Thus, in those portions of Revelation which, from the necessity of the case, touch upon those subjects which it is the province of the intellect to comprehend, or where, as has been said, "scientific investigation, whether physical, physiological, or historical, runs up into regions which have been at one time or other monopolized by Theology" all that can be expected from Revelation, in accordance with its own plan, is a description of phenomena. And by this is meant, statements historically true, even if scientifically imperfect, satisfied with conveying truthfully the ap-

pearances presented to the writer, without going on to interpret them, when such interpretation could be only given by miraculously imparting portions of that class of truth which it is the mission of the human intellect to comprehend by the progressive exercise of its own faculties. Let it be freely granted that a Book, purporting to be a Revelation from Him Who is the source of all knowledge and all truth, is self-condemned if it contain any proof of ignorance or falsehood; if it states as a fact that which did not actually occur, or appear to occur; or, giving an explanation of facts, if it gives one which is confessedly inaccurate. This does not touch such statements as that the "sun and moon stood still" at the battle of Gibeah; for this is simply a description, historically truthful, of a certain phenomenon which really did occur, and of certain events which really did follow. It only stops short at the historical truth, and does not explain the scientific truths which lay beneath it as its cause.

Again, it must be noted, that these historical descriptions are, in a great measure, simply phenomenal, and only describe the event, and the secondary causes, just as another historian might have described them in writing of the same events. For instance, when we are told that the children of Israel "could not conquer the inhabitants of the valley because they had chariots of iron," it is evident that the words are only the expression of a fact as it presented itself to the comprehension of the Israelites. That an objection may be raised to the passage (as one has been raised) as if it represented the power of GOD to be unable to contend with iron chariots, is simply an unworthy attempt at a sneer, which proves nothing but the bitterness of the author.

So too, the man of science will learn a lesson from his own experience, of the distinction that is ever to be drawn between truth and the interpretation of truth. For he will know how continually new interpretations are being given of the truths taught by material facts, fresh solutions arising of the problems of which Science claims the elucidation as her own peculiar province. But the facts of the physical world are no less the embodiments of the Creator's purpose, and historians of the Creator's will, because various interpretations of their records are possible to the human intellect; and the words of Revelation are no less simply true, because the truth which they contain may present itself under various aspects to the minds of various men. It implies great confusion of thought to direct an argument against the words of Scripture, the only real force of which is against a certain interpretation of the words. Thus, granting, for the sake of argument, that Science had disproved the fact of

a. Deluge ever having been universal over the whole earth, it is simple juggling with words to formularize the result as if the accuracy of the Scriptural account of the Deluge was thus disproved. For it is perfectly consistent both with the strictest theory of Inspiration and the fullest recognition of the claims of Science, to hold that increasing knowledge has given us the key to the true interpretation of the words, and that the meaning which the words will fairly bear, as describing a deluge universal as to the human race, and the district in which they dwelt, is that which is intended to be represented by the words of Scripture. Such a solution may, or may not, be the right one. Still, it is possible, and at least sufficient to meet the requirements of an argument which, on the part of Science, is founded, in a most marked manner, on probabilities instead of proof. The man of science will thus find no difficulty in recognizing his own position as an interpreter of the Word of GOD, without losing the awful reverence due to that volume which claims to speak as the Creator's own declaration of a certain portion of His own will, and certain of His own purposes. He will be able to assert the sovereignty of Reason in its own domain, without swerving from his allegiance to the sanctity of the royal priesthood given to Faith. He will learn to understand what now seems strange and perplexing, by reference to his own experience, knowing how true is the old proverb that "Truth is stranger than fiction," and how many things in his own history have been brought about in strange ways and by unexpected means. And he will be able to lean in the darkness quietly and securely on his faith, in the certainty that since there is One GOD, and the Truth of GOD is one, it must be possible to unite a full admission of the claims of the two interpreters of His purposes, implying as it does the probability of interpretations varying for a while, with an absolute certainty that there is only one interpretation truly possible to be given to GOD's works or to GOD's word, and that this one interpretation will be manifest in the end.

This expectation of present variety of opinion passing ever into the unity of truth, is the very result that would have been looked for from the given data of two interpreters authorized yet not absolutely infallible, engaged side by side on the same works with different instruments—Science, eliciting truth as the product of the human intellect, exercised upon the *works* of GOD; Revelation, giving out truth through the medium of the human intellect, exercised upon the *words* of GOD. And such results indeed are ever manifest in the experience of the past. Every separate department of Science, at its first beginning, has always, as if by an inevitable law, started off into paths seemingly diverse from those

laid down in Revelation as the way to truth. Yet, in time, it has come back to the old ways, and sought again the old paths, clearing up its own difficulties by a brighter light, answering its own objections by a more perfect knowledge, till we have seen them, as has been eloquently even if, as may seem to some, over hopefully, said of Geology, "after many years of wandering from theory to theory, or rather from vision to vision, return once more to the home where she was born, and to the altar at which she made her first simple offering; no longer, as she first went forth, a wilful, dreamy, empty-handed child, but with a matronly dignity, and a priest-like step, and a bosom full of well-earned gifts to pile upon its sacred hearth." (Wiseman. *Connection of Science with Religion*, p. 209.)

It is well known that such has been the course with those départments of Science which may be called the more perfect, that is, which have reached to such a point as to be able to present their conclusions with something of an air of certainty. Take Astronomy as an instance—that science which, at its birth, was the first to come into collision with Revelation, as appearing to take up the position of a rival interpreter of GOD'S purposes. Once, in its earlier days, it was supposed to contradict the written word of Scripture; then again, in later times, it became the instrument of a subtle scepticism, as if its proclamation of the fathomless infinity of the works of GOD, rendered it impossible to suppose that all the special love and care displayed in the Atonement could have been lavished upon earth alone, this speck in the infinity of the universe. And it will be remembered how the gigantic intellect of Chalmers crushed down, at once and for ever, those weak defences which scepticism had constructed as a hiding place and refuge; drawing from Astronomy itself, when rightly understood, the most perfect illustrations of the special Providence, as well as of the infinite Power of the Creator:—"It was the telescope," he says, "that, by piercing the obscurity that lies between us and distant worlds, put infidelity in possession of the argument against which we are now contending. But about the time of its invention, another instrument was formed, which laid open a scene no less wonderful, and rewarded the inquisitive spirit of man with a discovery which seemed to neutralize the whole of the argument. This was the miscroscope. The one led me to see a system in every star; the other leads me to see a world in every atom. The one taught me, that this mighty globe, with the whole burden of its people and of its countries, is but a grain of sand on the high field of immortality. The other teaches me, that every grain of sand may harbour within

it the tribes and families of a busy population." . . . And then he goes on to say: "Now, mark, how all this may be made to meet the argument of our infidel astronomers. By the telescope they have discovered that no magnitude, however vast, is beyond the grasp of the Divinity. But, by the microscope, we have also discovered that no minuteness, however shrunk from the notice of the human eye, is beneath the condescension of His regard. Every addition to the power of the one instrument extends the limit of His visible dominion. But, by every addition to the power of the other instrument we see each part of them more crowded than before with the wonders of His unwearying hand." "They, therefore (continues Chalmers), who think that GOD will not put forth such a power and such a goodness, and such a condescension on behalf of this world, as are ascribed to Him in the New Testament, think of Him as a man. They confine their views to the information of the telescope, and forget altogether the information of the other instrument." "For," he adds, speaking of Revelation, "let it tell me as much as it may of GOD letting Himself down for the benefit of one single province of His dominions. This is no more than what I see lying scattered in numberless examples before me; and, now that the microscope has unveiled the wonders of another region, I see strewed around me, with a profusion that baffles my every attempt to comprehend it, the evidence that there is no one portion of the universe of GOD too minute for His notice, nor too humble for the visitations of His care." (*Astronomical Discourses.* Lecture III.)

And so, to us, Astronomy is not only no rival interpreter of the Revelation, but a valued and a tried ally, who both enables us to understand more perfectly the words of Holy Writ, seeing more clearly the splendour of the glory they contain, "the heavens declaring the glory of GOD, and the firmament showing His handywork," and also stands by us in the moment of our need, putting replies into our mouths to some most formidable difficulties, as they once seemed—very giants stalking in their might before the firm array of scepticism. It is Astronomy that teaches us that light may be separated from the sun, that it has probably an existence of its own, independent of that which seems to us its centre and its source; so that, if light be no mere emission from the sun, all difficulty vanishes when we read that GOD said "Let there be light," long before He placed the sun in "heaven to give light upon the earth."

So, too, Astronomy gives one more glorious witness to the unity of GOD, leading up into a yet more wonderful field of thought, when we behold the sun itself and all the systems that depend

upon it, not isolated in the expanse of immensity, as if perfect in itself, but revolving ever round some distant centre, bound to some point of inconceivable remoteness, by a law that is not to be broken. Herein it not only gives us another witness to the unity of creation, but also leads up our thoughts to the distant contemplation of a mighty mystery; as if here, possibly, we might look for the answer to those problems which vex us now by the imperfect responses which they give to our eager questionings, and might find the point where mind and matter meet, the true union of the material and the spiritual, in the material universe ever revolving around Him Who, as He has told us in His holy Word, is Himself "a Spirit."

Or take another science, History, to which we know that scepticism has lately appealed, as if its evidence were contrariant to that of Scripture, in, at least, so many minute particulars as to throw discredit on the whole. In this science also, we have a recurrence of the process which we have so plainly seen in the case of Astronomy—apparent discrepancies on many minor points, some things hard to reconcile with the plain words of Scripture, indications seeming to point out different paths as leading to the truth from those declared in the Word of GOD; yet these, chiefly inferences, probabilities, indications, having little claim to the title of clear and undoubted discoveries, and ever vanishing under the process of more accurate investigation, or of knowledge brought to bear upon them from sources external to themselves.

While fully recognizing, then, the existence of difficulties on minor points, we do most confidently claim secular history as the ally of that which we call sacred; the outlines of the secular history of the nations of the world, as they stand out more sharply definite against the increasing light, ever appearing more distinctly to coincide with those which are drawn for us in Holy Writ; the fragments of the histories of secular kingdoms, which have been rescued here and there out of the thick darkness of the past, fitting into the places into which they ought to fit in the history of the chosen people of JEHOVAH. And as more knowledge of the past reaches us from new and unsuspected sources, as more new sculptures, or new records come to light from cities that have long crumbled into dust, and faded from the memories of mankind, as the mysterious handwriting on the wall gives out a clearer meaning to the insight growing upon patient industry, as its reward and crown; so much the more do we learn and value History as an ally of Holy Writ, explaining here a difficulty, interpreting there a dark passage, in one place

correcting the error in our understanding of the words, in another confirming into absolute certainty some statement that seemed improbable and strange; but ever, as itself becomes more perfect, as its declarations become more thoroughly the words of ascertained and of undoubted truth, giving the believer cause for thankfulness for its explanation of his difficulties, and, if need be, for its confirmation of his faith.

Or take yet another instance, in the progress of Biblical criticism, the collation of manuscripts, the endeavour to ascertain by the most minute and microscopical inquiry, whether the text which we receive in our volume of Revelation is indeed the perfect Word of GOD. There were many who feared, when the first results of these studies were promulgated to the world, that faith would be weakened, and the authority of Scripture lessened, by the discovery of innumerable variations of translators and transcribers; the numberless imperfections in the record dimming our sense of the perfectness of the truth which it reveals. Yet this too has had its issue in a more complete witness to the truth. It has corrected our ideas in some minute points, detecting here and there errors and imperfections on the surface, traces which the touch of fallible humanity will ever leave on Divine truth committed to its grasp; yet, on the whole, it has given cheering evidence that the Church has been enabled to preserve inviolate and uncontaminate that precious treasure of Holy Scripture which has been committed to her care. So much, at least, seems proved by the following summary of the conclusions arrived at by this science, as it bears upon our present argument:—

"Not indeed that there has been any lack of abundant differences of readings; on the contrary, the number is overpowering. Mill's first effort produced 30,000, and the number may be said daily to increase. But in all this mass, although every attainable source has been exhausted, although the fathers of every age have been gleaned for their readings, although the versions of every nation, Arabic, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopian, have been ransacked for their renderings, although manuscripts of every age, from the sixteenth upwards to the third, and of every country, have been again and again visited by industrious swarms to rifle them of their treasures; although, having exhausted all the stores of the West, critics have travelled, like naturalists, into distant lands, to discover new specimens—have visited, like Scholz or Sebastiani, the recesses of Mount Athos, or the unexplored libraries of the Egyptian and Syrian deserts, yet has nothing been discovered, no not one single various reading which can throw doubt upon any passage before

considered certain or decisive, in favour of any important doctrine." (Wiseman, *Connection*, &c., p. 353.)

There is no doubt about the simple fact, that there are other departments of science in which the process, so far accomplished in the case of astronomy, is still going on. And doubtless, there will be ever such, as men's insight into the complex mysteries of the material world grows gradually more complete and full, till all knowledge and all faith are merged into the fulness of that perfect vision which is the blessedness of the great Hereafter. Yet even in these, we are never left entirely without indications that the same results will eventually follow, when clearer light enables us to discern more perfectly those boundary lines of truth which are now dim and indistinct, as in the morning mists before the dawning of the day; even in these, if, on the one hand, we find new difficulties arising on certain points of faith, so on the other, as by a law of compensation, we ever find some new light thrown on other portions of the revealed purposes of GOD, some knowledge given, for which we may be thankful, as helping faith to understand more clearly and grasp more heartily those mysteries of the will of GOD which are committed to its peculiar charge. The increasing stores of human knowledge are so dispensed to us by the will of Him from Whom all knowledge comes, that help is never wanting to the faith of those who look for it with heedful eyes. To those who can look onwards to the future with as firm a faith as that in which the great discoverer held his way, self-confident, over the unknown seas, indications will never be wanting to confirm their trust, and show them that the truth, when it does appear, will be the solution of their difficulties in the very way which they expect. To such will never be wanting the floating drift weed, the land birds on the rigging, the carved staff borne upon the waves, to prove, that although very far away, though not at present will even the tremulous light appear upon the distant shore, yet the land in which they trust their haven will be found, is surely there, and will be seen when the due time is come.

And this will be apparent, if, as an example, we take the branch of science whose conclusions are supposed to be most difficult to reconcile with those which are derived from the study of the book of Genesis. We mean Geology. It will be fair, in stating the case as to the points on which Geology is supposed to collide with Holy Scripture, to use the words of one who maintains most strongly the claims of human reason, as opposed to those of an objective Revelation. The following statement is from a pamphlet, very temperately written, entitled *Science and*

Theology, by Mr. Hanson, Chief Justice of South Australia. He says:—"Geology has, I believe, utterly exploded the notion of creation in six days, as given in the first chapter (of Genesis), as well as the idea of a universal Deluge; and it is gradually throwing back the first appearance of man upon the globe to an antiquity which, according to present appearances, will ultimately be measured by hundreds of thousands of years."—(P. 20.)

We may pass at once from the difficulty as connected with the universality of the Deluge, which, after all, is a matter affecting the interpretation, not the veracity of Holy Scripture, the solution of which, at most, will only help us to the true understanding of what Scripture really means. So again, as to the supposed antiquity of man upon the earth; it is undoubtedly an opinion formed on most imperfect knowledge, and deduced from premises doubtful in themselves, by a very questionable chain of reasoning. This too, at the most, is a question rather affecting the chronology than the main facts of Holy Scripture, enabling us, it may be, to detect in this certain errors which have been absorbed into its perfection, from the handling of the human instruments to whose keeping it has been committed. Even as to the chief difficulty,—the six days of creation,—all that can be said is, that Geology has taught us to be distrustful of our own interpretations of the words of Scripture; to distinguish carefully in our minds between the truth as it is revealed, and as it comes to us through the medium of our faculties; to learn the humility of waiting for the perfect understanding of all truth, whether physical or spiritual, till the time when we shall comprehend it, either with new faculties, or with some glorious development of those which we now possess, possibly as the rudiments alone of those which are hereafter to be ours. The theologian cannot say with certainty whether an absolute blank and void had been made upon the earth by the elimination of its previous inhabitants, and thus the period spoken of in the book of Genesis is a literal hexameron; or whether, as it seems to many more, in accordance with the phraseology of Scripture itself, the "days" represent periods of indefinite length, and the account is simply that of the chief phenomena attendant on the processes by which the earth took its present shape, and was peopled with the existing types of animal and vegetable life. Nor can the geologist say more, than that appearances seem to testify that an indefinite period of immense length must have intervened between the creation of the earth and the condition in which we find it at the present time; and that, though scarcely any of the species of plants and animals now existing are absolutely identical with those which

peopled the earth in antecedent periods, yet it seems most in accordance with the deductions of reason, from the facts which are before it, that there has been no violent disruption of the chain of life, from the era when the rhyzopod first appeared in the Laurentian rocks, the first-fruits of life upon the globe.

But while it is freely admitted that Geology, in some points, has brought us face to face with certain difficulties, and made some trial of our patience and our faith, it must not be forgotten, in how many other ways this science has helped us, from the works of GOD, to obtain a clearer understanding of His word. Even in the first chapter of Genesis, Geology has confirmed the general statements of Holy Scripture on so many particulars, and those relating to subjects of which it cannot be supposed that the writer of the Scriptural account could have had any knowledge from what we call the discoveries of Science, that it seems impossible, even from this point of view, to doubt that the knowledge which dictated this account came from the Source of truth. A writer of that ancient date, who could distinguish between the presence of light and the presence of the sun; who could relegate the first appearance of the sun, as an influence upon the earth, to a period coinciding with that of the appearance of the season-rings in plants; who could place man as the last product of creation, separating him and his own will altogether from any share in the production of inferior animals, and allotting to him so exactly the place which he fills, and the lordship which he holds; who could distinctly enunciate the fact of the present Sabbath of creation, the fact that since the appearance of man upon the earth, no further act of creation has been wrought upon its surface, must, even common sense allows it, have received his revelation of the Creator's purpose (whether by vision, or in allegory, or by direct dictation, except as matter of curiosity, concerns us not) from some external source to which the secrets of creation and the mysterious processes of life were thoroughly and intimately known. And, if this be granted, the rest is subject of inquiry rather than of faith, of interpretation rather than of veracity.

Again, when dwelling on the difficulties which attend the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, it is not fair to pass over the striking corroboration which Science gives to that double fact which it is the whole sum and purpose of the chapter to declare. For nothing in the whole witness of Science is more clear than this, that One Creator made the earth from the beginning, that running through all its history is the unmistakable evidence not only of one Will and of one Agent, but of a will and agency

exercised upon one single purpose, and working towards one single end. Nothing is more clear, even from the records of Geology, than this; that the earth had one Creator, and that the Creator made the earth for man. This unity of plan and purpose is evident and manifest from the beginning to the end. It is evident in the ages in which the little insects were storing up the abundance of their lime in coral reefs. It is evident in the epochs through which a wonderful vegetation was laying up incalculable stores of coal. It is evident in the long periods of volcanic action upheaving superincumbent masses, cleaving the hard granite rock, and bringing these materials for the use of man into positions in which he, the only one of GOD'S creatures who could understand their preparation and their use, should find and employ them for his purposes. It is evident, again, through the long era in which unknown agencies were depositing rich veins of precious metals over the dry sands and among barren rocks, that, in the future, man, drawn by these treasures to the dark corners and waste places of the earth, might fulfil the task entrusted to his charge, to replenish the earth and subdue it. And it is evident in the gradual alteration of the typical forms of life, ever assuming shapes most suited to man's use and service, till, immediately before his entrance on the scene, the fruit-bearing tribes of the Rosaceæ, the corn-bearing grasses, the cod among fishes, the sheep among animals, appear on earth as heralds of his coming; all witnessing more or less distinctly, even in the typical forms which created animals successively assumed, to the One Creator and the one purpose, all declaring that One Creator made the earth, and that "the earth hath He given to the children of men."

So far then, we may accept Geology, not as a rival of Theology, but as one who, helping to interpret the words of Holy Writ, has also helped, by the same process, to confirm and strengthen faith. And this will be seen more clearly, in considering the voice with which it speaks with regard to the incredulity that lies at the root of so many of the seeming objections to the truth of Revelation, with regard to that indisposition to admit direct interference, which we call miraculous agency, among the causes which have been instrumental in producing the present state of things upon the earth, whether in its physical or moral aspects. Thus then, to quote again from the pamphlet to which reference has been made, we find it said:—"Theologians assert that these books are the direct utterance of the Supreme Being, and that whatever is therein asserted must not only be received as literally true, but must, if needs be, in order to its reception, be consi-

dered as withdrawn from the operation of the ordinary laws of nature, and as being in the strictest sense miraculous; and this, if admitted, would be fatal to the pretensions of Science." This assertion is as plain as it is bold, and means no less than this—that any proved miraculous interference with the ordering of the world, would be "fatal to the pretensions of Science," that is, of Science as the word is interpreted by the particular school which Mr. Hanson represents.

To make this assertion good, one of two things must be proved. Either that our knowledge of the processes of creation is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of a possible direct interference; or, that the actual non-existence of such interference is a matter capable of proof. For the first, we have only to suppose the existence of a Person above and separate from creation, expressing His purposes in those processes which are called "the Laws of Nature," but retaining in His own hands those agencies the secondary manifestations of which constitute the phenomena of creation upon which all our reasoning is based, and there seems to be no difficulty in supposing the possibility or even the probability of miraculous interference. For miraculous interference merely supposes the presence of a will, bringing about results as it pleases, either simply as manifestations of its presence, or through the medium of certain secondary causes, the manner of whose operation is unknown. In fact, once admit distinctly the idea of an Independent Supreme Will, distinct from nature and above nature, and the question of miracles becomes simply a question of belief, not whether they are possible or probable, but whether, as a matter of fact, there is proof that they have been actually performed.

Here, then, we join issue directly with the passage quoted above, and affirm, in contradiction to the assertion that Science comes into collision with Theology, that true Science and true Theology, as allied forces, come into collision with the pretensions of that which is falsely called Science. For surely, to one who reads the record of creation aright, nothing is more clearly apparent than the existence of this Independent Will, making itself felt at every step of the many processes by which creation has assumed its present shape, and giving itself visible expression in the forms into which it has moulded the creatures of the material world. The wonderful variety apparent on the face of creation, the diverse contrivances by which the same functions are discharged by a machinery infinitely complex, the same results produced by causes infinitely variable, the very existence of such minute varieties of growth, as that the kidney bean and hop

plant always twine round their poles in opposite directions (a variety utterly unaccountable for by any secondary causes), all seem deliberately made portions of the plan of creation, to prove to man the existence of a Supreme Will, a Will, that is, above and overruling, in a way incomprehensible to human reason, those phenomena which, in an imperfect and uncertain understanding, we call the laws of nature, and which therefore, though manifested in them, is in no way bound by them.

But again, passing on from the witness of physical science as to the credibility of miracles to its testimony as to the actual fact of their having formed a portion of the design of the Creator, we find in Geology an evidence most distinct and clear that so it has ever been from the beginning until now. For it will scarcely be denied that an act of creation is the greatest of all conceivable miracles in the physical world; greater than any act of renovation or destruction in the power manifested; greater in its interference with the so-called "laws of nature" than any anticipation of the processes by which the results of life are usually attained. And Geology at least affirms positively that this miracle, this act of creation, has been repeated continually since the beginning of the world, new shapes and forms of life appearing successively on the face of the earth at different epochs of its existence. And whether it be supposed that these forms of life were introduced gradually, one by one filling up the places of other existences which had died away, or appeared at different epochs in distinct groups, still they witness to that fact which is said to be "fatal to the pretensions of Science"—the existence of a Supreme Will interfering with the common course of nature, or, as it may be put in other words, the existence of miraculous agency.

In attributing, however, the appearance of these distinct groups of plants and animals to undoubted acts of creation, we come upon another point on which Science and Theology are supposed to be in collision. It is said in the pamphlet which has been already quoted—"If the world has existed under the same laws from the first moment of its formation, if all things have been slowly shaping themselves into fitness for the existence of higher and higher classes of being, organic and inorganic nature gradually assuming improved forms; and if, as the culmination of the long progress, man appeared at first in a low animal form, but gradually elevated to higher and higher types; then the whole doctrine of the Fall, as represented in our system of Theology, and of the present degradation of our race compared with its early elevation, and of the deterioration of external nature as a consequence, is obviously erroneous." (Pp. 24, 25.)

Here it may be observed, as we pass on to the main argument, that in this passage, either by carelessness or by design, the theories of men about the meaning of Revelation are mixed up, in utter confusion, with the declarations of Revelation itself. But, if we are careful to distinguish the utterances of Holy Scripture from the glosses of uninspired interpretation, it may be safely affirmed that Revelation says nothing positively about the deterioration of external physical nature as a consequence of the Fall. For whatever may be the true meaning of these mysterious words, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake," which were addressed to Adam, or "Thou art cursed above all cattle," which were spoken to the Serpent—words, we must remember, of which we possess no infallible explanation; or whatever change in the natural products of the earth may have been implied in the words "Thorns and thistles it shall bring forth to thee," as if, before the Fall, it had been as the dim old legends sing of the Age of Gold in the forgotten past, there is no proof that the sentence passed on man was shared (except seemingly in some mysterious way by the animal which had been the medium of temptation) by any other of GOD'S creatures.

Revelation, again, speaks of the degradation of man—by which is to be understood the physical and intellectual, as distinct from the moral degradation of man—as consisting only in the loss of innocence; or rather, in that which it is very doubtful whether the school represented by Mr. Hanson's pamphlet would consider degradation at all, the substitution of a higher and deeper knowledge, bringing with it increasing responsibilities and the necessity of more energetic action of the will, for a more safe and simple innocence. And, as the universal law is *per aspera ad ardua*, it seems consistent with what we know of the Divine purposes, to suppose (even without touching here on the change in man's relation to the Creator wrought by the Incarnation) that the toil and suffering brought in by sin are converted by the grace of GOD into means of elevation rather than of degradation, and become a sort of S. Augustine's ladder—

> "Rising on its wrecks, at last
> To something nobler we attain"—

on which man, in his individuality, mounts ever upwards and ever onwards into a more true expansion and development of all his faculties, and intellect, and will, than would have been possible had he remained for ever in the childlike simplicity of Eden.

Apart from this, however, we may assert distinctly, calling

again what some would term a rival to our aid, that this theory of progressive development is supported by no true interpretation of the works of GOD, as declared to us in the study of Geology. First, because (to condense the argument which Hugh Miller has so thoroughly worked out) all successive orders of animals appear upon the scene in typical forms, exhibiting the full perfection belonging to their nature, with no signs of partial development, or power as yet incomplete upon them, and, as they vanish, rather exhibit tokens of degradation than any traces of a fuller growth or expansion of a higher organization. Secondly, because the marks and notes of difference and minute variety in the several species witness distinctly to a Supreme Will, and cannot be derived by any imaginable process of direct development out of former or coexistent types. Thus writes Hugh Miller, in his *Footsteps of the Creator*:—"It seems truly wonderful, when one considers it, to what minute and obscure ramifications that variety of pattern which nature so loves to maintain, is proved to descend. It descends in the fishes, both recent and extinct, to even the microscopic structure of their teeth; and we find, in consequence, not less variety of figure in the sliced fragments of the teeth of the ichthyolites of a single formation, than in the carved blocks of an extensive calico print-yard. Each *species* has its own distinct pattern, as if, in all the individuals of which it is composed, the same block had been employed to stamp it, and each *genus* its own general *type* of pattern, as if the same radical idea, variously altered and modified, had been wrought upon in all. . . . It has appeared to me, that at least a presumption against the transmutation of species might be based on those inherent peculiarities of structure which are thus found to pervade the entire texture of the framework of animals. If we find erections differing from one another merely in external form, we have no difficulty in conceiving how, by additions and perfections, they might be brought to exhibit a perfect uniformity of plan and aspect. Transmutation, development, progression (if one may use the term), seem possible in such circumstances. But if the buildings differ from each other, not only in external form, but also in every inch and beam, bolt and nail, no mere scheme of external alteration could induce a real resemblance. The problem could not be wrought by the remodelling of an old house, the only mode of solving it would be by the erection of a new one." (P. 83.)

Let it be remarked also, before we pass away from the development theory, that neither History nor Ethnology lend more real support than their sister science Geology, to this dream of men

gradually elevated from lower to higher types. We stand on a platform far higher than our predecessors in the dim past. The accumulation of knowledge, and the stores of experience are our heritage, piled up into gigantic mountains, whereon we climb and look over a wider prospect. But we who stand upon these heights are the same in physical structure and intellectual capacity, save only in those modifications which the refinements of civilization and the added carefulness of life have naturally brought on upon us. Our physical powers can hardly be much greater than those of the races who put together the vast masses of Cyclopean masonry, or built the gigantic platform of the palace-temple at Nimroud. Tennyson and Browning have not yet hurled down Homer and Pindar from their glorious Olympian thrones. The powers of calculation were hardly deficient in the men who painted the planisphere of Dendera, or handed down, as the Hindoo astronomers, predictions of eclipses from the most remote ages. Nay, the very artistic faculties, however uncultivated, could scarcely have been wanting to the rude savages who piled up the Danish "midden heaps," among whose remains are found such things as "a poniard cut out of a reindeer's horn, in which the ingenious adaptation of the position of the animal to the exigencies of the case would not disgrace Froment Meurice." All History with one consentient voice appears to prove that, in spite of yearning, and longing, and pressing forward through unknown ages, the faculties of the individual man at least have shown no token of development into higher organizations, no trace of growth, as distinguished from the improvement wrought by cultivation and experience, no signs of passing onwards (except as Revelation teaches, through the gate of death) into higher and progressive types.

These are merely illustrations of the principle which it has been the object of this Essay to elucidate. What then seems to be the reasonable conclusion of the Churchman with regard to the relative attitudes of these two Interpreters of the Will of God, Science and Revelation? Surely this—that, as all facts teach us, the Creator has willed to reveal Himself to His creatures in two distinct and separate ways, by His works and by His word; and since both these are from one source, indicative of the presence not only of Truth, but of Him Who is the Truth, therefore we may be content to assume that they must of necessity and in reality bring the same tidings, speak with the same voice, utter the same message. This he accepts not only on the ground of past experience, but as the necessary consequence from the

premises from which he starts, that the material world and the book of Revelation are both from GOD. And thus he feels that to look forward from our present stand-point into the future, and to affirm that the tendency of Holy Scripture and Science is to come into collision at the point on which they traverse common ground, is both unworthy and unphilosophical. It is as unworthy, as was the faint spirit of the sailors of Columbus, seen in its true light, by contrast with his reasonable and thus unwavering faith. It is as unphilosophical as it would be, if one were to stand between two lines of rail, and affirm, because sight seemed to prove it, that they meet together at a certain point.

But with this expectation comes another, resting upon grounds as reasonable and as sure. For the recognition of two distinct interpreters of the will of GOD, both of which are at once indisputable in their authority, and yet fallible when used as human instruments concerned about His word and His work, seems to imply that the interpretations which these severally enunciate, being fallible as the sources from which they came, may be expected to vary for a while. And experience in this confirms the expectation founded upon these premises, showing that perfect truth is only arrived at by the correction of mistakes and by the elimination of errors; and is only apparent as the product elicited, by processes inevitably long, from the misapprehensions and the hasty judgments to which human reason is exposed. So the Churchman will be content to wait patiently, weighing, correcting, proving his own judgment, as travellers who in a new country correct their impressions of the form of the objects around them, and the relative bearings of the mountain peaks, as the grey light of morning clears and brightens into the perfect day. Accepting Revelation as an infallible record of the Divine will, he will own that this too has come down to us through the instrumentality of human agencies; without an interpreter as infallible as itself on questions of physical Science, and its meaning thereon; and with a mixture of the element of human fallibility of necessity absorbed into it, as it comes into his hand through the inevitable processes of translation, of copying, of interpretation. Accepting Science as a commissioned though fallible interpreter of the works of GOD, he will be ready, while he examines its conclusions with a rigid scrutiny, to receive them with a certain reverence and reasonable submission; he will be thankful for them when they give him a clearer insight into the meaning of the Word, when they enable him to discern little errors which have crept into the record itself, or into its interpretation; when

they enable him to separate clearly the opinion of men about Revelation from that which is indeed revealed.

Thus, not in hasty fear or trembling, lest some coming storm, surging up from some unexpected quarter should prove that the edifice of his hope is built upon the sand, will he look upon the progress of advancing Science, and listen to the dim sounds and the faint murmurs borne to him out of the dark future. He will wait, as he might wait on the bosom of some vast lake, which he knows to be the source of a mighty river, even though he cannot tell the exact boundaries of the lake itself, or the outlet whence the river flows. Yet he will wait patiently, knowing that his comrades, toiling upwards from the river's mouth must eventually arrive at the same goal which he himself has found, and nothing doubting, though their white sails in the distance, following the river-course, seem sometimes bending in directions varying from, nay, even opposite to, the point where he himself awaits them. In patience he will wait, in patience possessing his soul, welcoming every stray beam of light, every detached fragment of truth, as undoubtedly indications of the presence of the GOD of Light and Truth, though he cannot as yet recognize the place of the one in the mighty edifice, or trace the other to the point at which it issued out of the mighty splendours of the dawn. In patience he will wait, knowing that all voices which utter portions of the truth, though they seem to sound in discord now, will fall into their place in the great harmony wherewith perfect Truth shall be declared to men, that all true interpretations differing now, as men look on different sides and different aspects of the Truth, shall speak with one voice, in the day when neither GOD'S works nor GOD'S words shall be needed to declare Him to His faithful ones, for as they know assuredly, they shall "see Him as He is."

The Conscience Clause.

THE design of this paper is to explain the issue between the Church and the Committee of Council on a question which is admitted to "stop the way[1]" in the progress of National Education. The obstruction is caused by the Committee's attempt to force into the trust deeds of Church schools what they are pleased to call a "Conscience clause," for the benefit of Dissenters. The origin, extent, and application of this provision are shrouded in studied ambiguity,—or, to use the latest euphemism, in a "reticence[2],"—which is defended on the ground of further developments being in contemplation. Its "principle" is a very Proteus; it takes a new form to every inquirer, and the strongest grasp hardly compels a last disclosure. It is even denied to this hour that any Conscience clause has been imposed at all. "The Committee," says their astute secretary, "do not admit that they impose Conscience clauses[3];"—they only "suggest" them, and refuse the grant if the suggestion is not adopted! Mr. Lowe splits the hair to a still finer point. He denies the "suggestion." He simply refused the grant: there his duty ended. "But if the applicants chose to come and say they would remove the difficulty (by admitting the Conscience clause), then I was able to make the grant. *The Conscience clause came from the other side*[4]."

Mr. Lowe thinks it highly unfair to call this enforcing the clause, because that was not his end. He really did not care for the clause (or the consciences), but would "have been quite as

[1] *Times*, 26th December, 1865.

[2] "I will not here discuss the policy of this reticence, which is open to some objections from other points of view."—*Fortnightly Review*, No. xiv. p. 172. This article by Mr. Shaw Lefevre is written with some ability on the side of the Department, but discloses no acquaintance with the history of the Clause or the real state of the controversy.

[3] Evidence before Sir John Pakington's Committee; House of Commons, Paper 403, 23rd June, 1865, Question 301.

[4] Ibid. Q. 648. This is a favourite point with Mr. Lowe. He repeats it in answer to Q. 702. "My wish has rather been, that people would not come for money at all. I would rather they should not have had the grant, but have built the school out of their own money, than that they should have a grant with a Conscience clause." But, then, what was the use of Mr. Lowe and the Committee of Council?

well or better pleased that the public money should be saved" by withholding the grant and quashing the school. "*I* force you into the ditch!" exclaims the dialectical highwayman: "you crept in of your own accord—to escape my revolver. It was your own act. For my part I should have been better pleased to have shot you dead on the road."

On the whole, perhaps, Mr. Bruce is the wiser man when he acknowledges that in the correspondence, "conducted very much as when Mr. Lowe was in office, it is always clearly indicated that the objection is not absolute, but that it depends upon the admission of certain securities to Dissenters. The letter always conveys that meaning[5]."

This candid reply helps us to a further point. The designation "Conscience clause" is a mere claptrap, and provokes the retort "Anti-Conscience clause." If we are not simply to bandy epithets, it will be well to accept Mr. Bruce's definition. It is a clause "*to give securities to Dissent in Church schools.*"

When we ask if such a design is consistent with the Denominational principle on which the parliamentary grants were originally based, Mr. Lingen volunteers the assurance that, "with the exception of increased strictness in examining the preliminary statement of each case, my Lords have not changed the principles upon which their grants for building schools are administered[6]." This is only to say, that, with the exception of the change which occasions all the controversy, nothing has been changed. When asked point blank—"How long has the practice existed of refusing building grants in certain cases unless a Conscience clause was inserted?" Mr. Lingen replies—"Within the last four or five years, I think[7]."

Exactly so; that is the innovation complained of: whether it involves a change of practice or a change of principle, is the question which now "stops the way."

A still greater amount of skirmishing has to be got through before we can come at the extent and application of the new rule: but let me say at once that I impute no wilful disingenuousness to its advocates. Some of them seem to me not to know where they are going, and are chiefly to blame for scolding all who tell them. There is a strong vein of pedantry in this Committee of Privy Council. There is a disposition—shown *inter alia* in the newly adopted title of "Educational Depart-

[5] Sel. Com. Ev., Q. 926.

[6] Letter to Rev. J. Lonsdale, 7th May, 1864: National Society's Report, p. xlii.

[7] Sel. Com. Ev., Q. 451.

ment"—to magnify their office to dimensions not only unauthorized, but strictly forbidden, by Parliament. There is a hankering after theories inconsistent with the scheme they were appointed to administer; and these mistakes are aggravated into an appearance of darker sins by the unhappy "reticence" which so often excites the suspicion that they mean more or less than they say[8]. These serious faults in the conduct of a public office we have a right to expose; but I have not a thought of imputing motives inconsistent with the high personal character of the distinguished statesmen whose names occur in the discussion.

The Conscience clause is presented to the Church as applying to building grants only, and that in places where the Dissenters are too few in number to sustain a second school for themselves[9]. In point of fact, this was *not* the case with the places where it was first introduced[1]; and the evidence before Sir John Pakington's Committee distinctly reveals that these are *not* the limits within which it is to be ultimately confined. Mr. Lowe declares the limited system a great mistake. "We should make no building grant whatever to a Church of England school without the Conscience clause being inserted[2]." Lord Granville goes further. His individual opinion is, "That if a reasonable Conscience clause were laid down, it would be very desirable to make it a condition both of building grants and annual grants[3]." He defends his policy of "reticence" on the express ground that this is the result he hopes to arrive at, and he concurs with Sir John Pakington that—"Parliament might say, If you adopt this clause you must carry it out to the full extent of the principle which it involves[4]."

[8] A curious illustration of these dark doings is given by Mr. Lonsdale from a case in Derbyshire, where, in settling the trust deed, somebody in the Council Office drew a pen through the words, "in union with, and in furtherance of the ends and designs of the National Society." The effect was to take the school out of union with the Society, and to forfeit its grant. The alteration was unknown to the managers, and nobody has ever explained its origin or author. Mr. Bruce denies all knowledge of it.—Evidence, 1538—1548, 1617—1622, 1814—1822, 1829—1832.

[9] Mr. Lingen's Letter to Rev. J. Lonsdale, 27th Nov., 1863: Nat. Soc. Report. 1864. Pp. xxxviii.—xxxix.

[1] Llanelly, the first of all, had a population of 16,000, and three or four schools; the three other cases, which followed the same year, were all in Wales, where the Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society would consider a Conscience clause almost an insult to the population, because three-fourths do not professedly belong to the Church.—Sel. Com. Ev. Q. 1499, 3536.

[2] Sel. Com. Ev., Q. 713. [3] Ibid., Q. 1936.

[4] Ibid., Q. 1934. This course is quite understood by Mr. Lefevre. "*What-*

On the extent of the principle so involved, the Lord President is not less explicit:—"I think that a clergyman has a perfect right to educate children according to his own creed, and to exclude all other children from the secular part of the teaching who do not choose to undergo the same religious instruction; *but the question appears to me quite changed when money from general taxpayers is required for the purpose of promoting that school*[5]." Here the "principle" is at last broadly and clearly laid down. It involves all grants whatever, and rests on the change supposed to have taken place in the "perfect rights" of school managers by their acceptance of the public money.

Having thus arrived at the question at issue, it may be well to see who are the parties to the controversy. Mr. Buxton fancies that the resistance to the new rule "emanates from a certain portion of the clergy imbued with the idea, that the priest or clergyman should be substituted for the parent with regard to the religious teaching of the children[6]." Now, seeing that in this country no priest or clergyman can be "substituted" in *any* charge of the children except by the parent himself, one can only marvel that such an "idea" as the honourable member's should have been entertained for a moment. Witness after witness testified to the Committee the wide-spread and increasing resistance of the "great mass of the clergy." The Dean of Ely has more recently described the clause as "seeming to the large majority of the members of the Church to involve the betrayal of a sacred trust[7]." These are weighty words, and others as weighty will presently be produced.

Meantime, it may suffice to say that the resistance is headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the National Society, and represents at least three-quarters of the practical working element in the day-schools of the poor. Indeed, it is only an isolated clergyman here and there, proud of his independent, not to say crotchety, views, who is brought forward to defend the clause. Dissenters themselves exhibit, as yet, but little interest in its support. They regard the benefit intended for them with noteworthy coolness; and if the "principle" ever gets beyond the schools of the Church, to be "carried out to its full extent" in

ever the future may have in store, the Conscience clause is only *now* insisted upon in the case of schools making a first application for a grant, and under the peculiar conditions of a small parish and a minority of Dissenters considerable enough to entitle them to protection."—*Fortnightly Review*, p. 171. Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird!

[5] Sel. Com. Ev. Q. 2454. [6] Ibid. Q. 2449—2452.

[7] Letter in the *Guardian*, 10th Jan., 1866.

their own, there is not a doubt that the religious part of them will join with the Church, *as they have joined before*, to resist it.

The question is, whether the receipt of grants from the public money operates an entire change, or any change, in the right of school managers with regard to the religious instruction of the children? To answer that question, we must revert to the conditions on which the grants were voted and accepted. The "Department" may turn its back upon its own origin, and laugh at the pledges of its founders as "lovers' perjuries;" but it will hardly be permitted to give protection to tender consciences by a breach of faith, or to found a system of National Education on the violation of Parliamentary pledges.

The question is not to be disposed of by any abstract theory of the rights of taxation. Three courses, at least, have been recognized in Parliament as open to the State, when making grants in aid of schools under voluntary management:—

1. The State may limit its requirements to secular instruction, leaving the managers to teach any or no religion at their pleasure. This is the *Secular* system.

2. The State may prescribe a general scheme of religious instruction for the children in common, and leave the managers to supplement it by further teaching to particular classes. This is the *Comprehensive* system.

3. The State may treat with the schools of the Church, or of any religious denomination, on its own principles, leaving the managers to direct the religious education in accordance with their own belief, and limiting State interference to the secular instruction. This is the *Denominational* system. It has the merit of being the only one of the three which secures religious education with no compromise of the rights of conscience.

Each of these systems is actually at work in different parts of the British empire; and it is remarkable, that Government is charged with breaking faith in every one. The Secular system is professed in India; but the missionaries complain that Government interferes to "protect" the heathen scholars from the just influence of the Bible. The Comprehensive was the scheme established in Ireland; but it was warped into such manifest "protection" of Romanism, that Archbishop Whately, was driven from the Board, and his successor Archbishop Trench is now earnestly demanding the Denominational principle[8]. The Denominational is the English system. It is the most

[8] The Romanists themselves have always made the same demand in respect to the Queen's University, and *Lord Russell is now about to yield to it.*

troublesome, the most impatient of bureaucratical interference —perhaps the most costly—of the three; but it was adopted as the most favourable to the rights of conscience and the English love of self-government. Our complaint is, that instead of leaving us to the free legitimate action of demand and supply, Government interferes to secure "protection" for Dissent in the Church schools.

What the practical and working educationalist requires, is that the system agreed upon should be accepted with all its consequences. When our time and money have been given to one system, we object to allow the Department charged with the administration of the grants to reopen the "principle" at their pleasure. If the Denominational system be unsound, it is for Parliament to say so. If it requires to be modified by an admixture of the other systems, let that also be openly debated and decided. School managers will then know what to do: but the perpetual tinkering of the Council Office is intolerable. In dealing with a variety of schools separately, it is to be expected that cases will sometimes arise where a modification of the standing rules might seem at first sight advisable, but those are just the cases which standing rules are meant to control. In mending a fancied hole, our educational tinkers are very apt to make two. They are at this moment, perhaps without knowing it, certainly without avowing it, subverting the Denominational system in favour of the Comprehensive, which in a free country must inevitably end in the Secular [9].

This was the view of the whole nation when the Council Office began to exist, and the greatest pains were taken to guard against its working round to the present situation. For what is the history of these grants of public money? They began in 1833, and for some years were administered by the Lords of the Treasury. They were then distributed in building-grants to schools in union with the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society, and always in proportion to the voluntary subscriptions. The vote, in fact, was treated as a vote in aid of the objects of those two Societies; the National Society requiring (as we all know) instruction in the Bible, Liturgy, and Catechism of the Church of England; the British and Foreign prohibiting creeds and formularies, but requiring the Bible, and disclaiming the appellation of Dissenters [1].

[9] The Comprehensive System can only be maintained under an arbitrary government, with compulsory education, and a stipendiary State clergy of the several recognized persuasions, as in Prussia.

[1] The present Secretary to the British and Foreign School Society maintains

In the year 1839 an Order of Council (10th April) transferred the disposal from the Treasury to a Committee of the Privy Council —a course adopted (it was said) in order to shut out the House of Lords, where the Bishops would have had a voice if the Department had been created by Act of Parliament. The original design contemplated a Central Board of Education, with a Central State Training School for Teachers, and a Model School in which all religions were to be educated together. Ministers of all persuasions were to be appointed for the religious instruction; and the Romish, Unitarian, and Jewish versions of the Scriptures were to be used alongside of the authorized English Bible. It was the *Comprehensive* scheme pure and simple; and it is due to its author Lord Russell, to acknowledge that he has never dissembled his opinion in favour of that plan. It awakened, however, the utmost alarm throughout the country. The Church, the Wesleyans, the British and Foreign Society itself, unanimously opposed it; and the Government saw the necessity of withdrawing the principal features of their scheme before they took it into the House of Commons.

First, the Committee's functions were limited to "superintending the application of any sums voted by Parliament," striking out the ambitious words, "considering all matters affecting the education of the people[2]." By a further Order of the 3rd June, the State schools were withdrawn, and the sum voted for Normal schools was equally divided between the National Society and the British and Foreign. All further grants were to be "chiefly applied" in building-grants for the support of schools in union with those two Societies. It was provided, however, that the rule of proportionate contributions observed by the Treasury should not be invariably adhered to, and power was reserved to make grants in particular cases to schools not in union with either Society. These two provisoes formed the whole amount of change which Government then ventured to propose to Parliament. Even so, their proposals met with the strongest resistance. In both Houses objection was taken to investing such indefinite powers in a committee composed exclusively of the Ministers of the day. In the House of Lords an address was moved by Archbishop Howley, and carried by an overwhelming majority (229 to 118), to cancel the appointment of the Committee of Council. Lord Stanley (now Lord Derby) moved a similar address in the Commons, which was lost

the same view. "A British School is not a school for Dissenters."—Evidence 3616.

[2] Order of Council, 10th April, 1839.

by only five votes (20th June), and the vote was finally carried by a majority of *two* (24th June).

Throughout these debates not a hint was dropped of any change to be effected in the powers of school managers by accepting the public money. A word to that effect would have turned out the Government, and sunk the Committee of Council "deeper than did ever plummet sound[3]." The most positive assurances were reiterated to the contrary. At the moment when the vote was trembling in the balance, and the ministerial leader was anxiously looking round for his majority of two, he declared that no change whatever was contemplated in the religious instruction in schools. "He did not suppose that it would at all interfere or at all oppose the instruction under the National, and the British and Foreign School, Societies; *for their plans and their regulations would remain precisely as at present, so far as this vote was concerned.* He certainly conceived that, with respect to the National Society, if this vote did pass, he should be bound to conform to the rules laid down with respect to any sums granted to the Society[4]." So spoke Lord John Russell in Parliament on the 24th June, 1839. In 1865 the President of the Council says—The question is "quite changed" by the Society's acceptance of the money so voted. If this had been said by an opponent of the grant in 1839, it would have been indignantly repelled as a calumny.

The question then debated was not, whether the grants would change the power of the Church in her own schools, but whether public money could be granted at all for any religious education but that of the Church? Mr. Gladstone argued, that to permit the Government "to combine education with the religion of all forms indifferently was a new and unconstitutional principle. He denied that it was involved in the previous grant to the British and Foreign School Society; pointing out that that Society professed no doctrine contrary to the Church, and that many Church children were educated in its schools. The State had never recognized the principle of teaching all forms of religion indifferently, and of placing truth and falsehood on a footing of equality[5]."

Lord Ashley (now Earl of Shaftesbury) contended that "the

[3] The Government would undoubtedly have been turned out as it was, and the whole design quashed, but for the peculiar state of parties. Lord Melbourne's Cabinet resigned in May, 1839, and returned to office in a few days, having defeated Sir Robert Peel's attempt to form a ministry. Consequently Sir Robert Peel was in no condition to turn them out again in June.

[4] Hansard, Parl. Deb., House of Commons, 20th June, 1839., vol. xlviii. p. 793.

[5] Ibid., p. 628.

Government scheme was hostile to the Constitution and the Church, and to revealed religion itself. If the children were to be taught this general religion together, and in open school, and then taken asunder for special instruction in the tenets of each, could that, he asked, have a beneficial effect on the children? Could it be beneficial to be told so early in life that religious opinions were so shifting and varying that some might be taught one thing and some another, there was no certainty whatever, and that the instruction given in one place was the reverse of the instruction in another? He would imagine a case which might easily occur. He would imagine three children sitting side by side, one a member of the Church of England, another a child of Socinian parents, and the third a child born of Jewish parents. Let those three children read together in school, during the time of general instruction, some particular portion of the Bible, suppose the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Let those children be taken away immediately after, for the purpose of special instruction, each from his own minister. What would be the effect on the minds of those three children? The child of the Church of England would learn the great, necessary, and saving truths in which nine-tenths of the community agree. The Socinian child would be taught that what the Church of England child believed was most gross error, and that the person to whom the prophecy referred was, in fact, no better than a mere man. But the Jewish child was taught to believe that the whole thing, from first to last, was an absolute imposition. It was impossible that these children could think any belief established or certain. The result would be universal scepticism, or a universal belief that there was nothing necessary—nothing certain. It was a new thing for the State to undertake to teach contradictions[6]."

Sir Robert Peel was of opinion that "the schools of the Church ought to be doctrinal, and the House should not shrink from educating the people in the principles supported by Parliament." With respect to the Established Church, he said: "I hope that rather than consent to any plan from which ecclesiastical authority is excluded, *it would separate itself altogether from the State on this point*—that it would take the education of the people into its own hands; that it would not shrink from insisting on the publication of its peculiar doctrines, but that it would demand that the highest respect should be entertained for its power by its being inculcated on the minds of the children that religion formed the basis of all education[7]."

[6] Ib., p. 279. Lord Shaftesbury has lately reiterated, at Dorchester, his undiminished aversion to the whole system of Government grants. [7] Ib., p. 674.

These are not the objections of a "certain portion of the clergy desirous of substituting the priest for the parent in the education of the young." The conditions now attempted to be annexed to the receipt of public money were distinctly rejected by the country which pays it. Parliament insisted on placing its grants under the protection of those very rights which are said to be "quite changed" by accepting them.

The money, in short, was voted for the two Societies on their own principles and regulations, and expressly to *prevent* the Committee of Council from carrying out the changes they now seek to introduce. So far from intending to place a restraint on Church schools as a security for Dissenters, Parliament only admitted the British and Foreign Schools on the ground that while omitting the special teaching of the Church they prescribed nothing contrary to it. Dissenters, as such, were, at that time *allowed no claim whatever on the public money:* and "State schools" were distinctly prohibited.

The only alteration in this system which has since taken place —at least avowedly—is the admission of Wesleyan and Roman Catholic schools to receive grants on the same terms with the National and British and Foreign schools. Their admission undoubtedly weakened the principle contended for by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Ashley, and Sir R. Peel. Still the concession was made only to recognized Denominations providing their own schools, without in any way affecting the schools of the Church. It was never conceived that the Committee of Council was thereby charged with the duty of directly providing for the consciences of individual Wesleyans or Roman Catholics; still less that they were to secure them a place in the schools of the Church by imposing restraints on the religious instruction prescribed by the rules.

The Committee of Council commenced its operations by issuing seven forms of Trust-deeds, defining the conditions on which the grants were to be administered. These deeds all contained two provisoes—1. That the fee of the site should be legally conveyed; and 2. That the schools should be open to Her Majesty's Inspectors. In other respects the trusts were varied according to the character of the school. Forms No. 1 and 5 were for National Schools, and required them to be in union with the National Society. Neither has any trace of a Conscience clause. No. 2, for a British and Foreign School, required in like manner union with that Society. It has no trace of a Conscience clause. Nos. 3, 4, and 7, were for schools not in union with either Society, and here only a Conscience clause is found. No. 6, for a parish

school founded by a spiritual corporation solely, not only has no Conscience clause but contains an express proviso that "*all* the children were to be educated in the principles of the Christian religion, according to the doctrine and discipline of the United Church, such education to be under the superintendence and direction of the rector or vicar."

These forms express the principle on which the grants were then administered;—1. To National Schools on their own system: 2. To British and Foreign Schools on their system: 3. To *other* schools on condition of a Conscience clause. There is no hint of the "principle" now laid down by Lord Granville. Under these trusts schools were multiplied, and Dissenters, who had previously devoted themselves chiefly to Sunday Schools, honestly assumed their part in the more onerous and efficient business of the day-school. They enjoyed their share of the grants, awarded by no unfriendly tribunal, and the Church made no complaint. The only grumbling arose from the unexpected discovery, that, make what rules they might, with any semblance of impartiality, the Committee of Council was always obliged to pay over five-sixths of the entire grants to the superior resources and activity of the Church.

Six or seven more years wore away in fairly harmonious activity on all sides, and in 1846 it was determined to extend the Parliamentary grants to the annual support, as well as the building, of schools. This necessitated a review of the whole system, in which the rights acquired by the State from the expenditure of public money were not likely to be underrated. Accordingly the Committee of Council produced an elaborate series of "Management clauses," carefully defining the obligations of the several classes of school managers. These clauses were received with marked disfavour by school managers generally, and canvassed with great warmth in the meetings of the National Society. Its Committee was censured, for at all allowing the claim of the Privy Council to insert conditions into the Trust-deeds of a National School. The opposition ceased in 1852, in consequence of some important concessions obtained from Lord Derby's Administration; but to the last the National Society's Committee refused to *enforce* the Management clauses, though they agreed to *recommend* them.

It is unnecessary to go into that controversy here, because it turned on the general rights of management rather than the special question of religious instruction. On this point there was then no question whatever; the Committee of Council acknowledged it in the amplest terms, and provided for it accord-

ing to the strictest signification of the National Society's rules. Every one of the clauses proposed for their schools contained the proviso that "they shall always be in union with and conducted according to the principles, and in furtherance of the ends and designs of the National Society." And further that "the principal officiating minister, for the time being, of the said parish, shall have the superintendence of the religious and moral instruction of *all* the scholars attending the school[8]." These were the conditions on which the annual grants were proposed and accepted. They are extant at this moment in the trust-deeds of the National Schools built during the last fifteen years, and their observance is, and ever must be, the legal condition of the grants in those schools from year to year.

In the face of these deeds, the public is told that "when we look for any proof of such a compact between the Committee of Council and the National Society, there is not a trace of it to be found. It is not even alleged that there was ever an express compact between them. It would clearly be beyond the power of the office to enter into a contract with a voluntary Society to go on for ever making building and other grants according to a prescribed form[9]." Can this writer have seen the deeds just quoted? Or does he mean to argue that, while legally binding on the school managers, they have no force, legal or moral, in the Department which imposed that obligation as one of the conditions of the grants? The managers are bound to conduct the school for ever according to these conditions. The donor of the site, or any parishioner, may take them into Chancery if they fail in their duty. The conditions were imposed by the Committee of Council as the consideration for the State grant; yet there is no trace of a compact, no allegation, no possibility of a contract!

To minds not attenuated by "the policy of reticence," it will be apparent that the debates in Parliament (1839) constituted a moral compact between the State and the voluntary Societies. This was reduced to an *express* compact by the Committee of Council with the school managers, first, as respected Building Grants in the Trust Deeds of 1839—40, and secondly, as respected Annual Grants in the Management clauses of 1849. On these deeds we take our stand. They expressly repudiate the rights now claimed for the State. The Department which insists at one moment that no change of principle has been made, cannot

[8] Management clauses A, B, D, C, 13th Aug., 1849. Min. Com. Council, Vol. i., p. xiii.

[9] *Fortnightly Review*, No. xiv., p. 170.

be allowed at the next to tear up its own deeds, and declare itself incompetent to lay down a binding principle at all.

During these discussions, great sensation was created by the avowal of an "unostentatious" policy in the Council Office. Archdeacon Denison took the alarm, and proclaiming that the next attack would be on the religious instruction, refused to have any thing more to do with the grants. He also urged the National Society to enforce their terms of union with greater rigour on the several schools; but on this point he was, in his own words, "well beaten." The Society declined to interfere with the discretion of the parochial minister, beyond referring the point to the consideration of the Bishops[1]. As an advocate for the widest freedom, both in Church and State, consistent with principle, I do not even now repent the vote I then gave with the majority. The Archdeacon allows the result to be "a happy arrangement[2]." And though the other extreme chooses to taunt us with having conceded the principle of the Conscience clause, the difference is as wide as between asking a friend to dinner, and having a regiment of dragoons quartered upon one for ever. The principle of the "happy arrangement" is well described by Mr. Lonsdale. It admits of a discretionary relaxation of rules, "whenever the clergy think they are thereby doing their best for Church education[3]." The principle of the Conscience clause is, to lay down a binding rule for ever in order to give security for Dissent in a Church school. The one is as nearly as possible the contradiction of the other; but the practical working shall be shown when we have done with the history.

Six years seems about the longest limit of truce in the Council Office. In 1858, twenty-one years from its creation—having "come of age," says Archdeacon Denison—it opened a new campaign. It was then that the Conscience clause had its genesis. The Royal Commissioners—whose opinions otherwise found little favour in the Council Office—complained of the "injustice" done to Dissenters, in places where they formed a minority too small to have a school of their own, by the Church obtaining the exclusive benefit of grants. The case of such Dissenters, however, differs nothing from that of all other persons who are shut out from a public benefit by being unable or unwilling to comply with the terms. In more than half the parishes of England the Church suffers the same "injustice." Eleven thousand small parishes are excluded from grants voted out of the general taxa-

[1] Nat. Soc. Gen. Meeting, 15th June, 1853. [2] Sel. Com. Ev., Q. 3684.
[3] Ibid., Q. 1848.

tion, because of their inability to meet the conditions of the Committee of Council. Dissenters, when not sufficiently numerous to get up a school of their own, are precisely in the same position. Lord Lansdowne counselled extra grants for their relief, but Lord Russell says, "The application of that principle would be very difficult." The Department is jealous of its own regulations, but it is not unwilling to make a liberal relaxation in those of the Church. It spares to take of its own flock for the wayfaring man, but thinks there can be no objection to cook the Church's lamb. Hence the project of laying a restraint upon Church schools, as a security for neglected or indifferent Dissenters.

The project of the Committee was not brought forward and openly discussed before its adoption, but with the usual "unostentatious" or "reticent" policy of the Department, it was quietly insinuated into the first openings that presented themselves. When complaint is made, Lord Granville, finding "his own withers unwrung," calmly replies that the Church promoters can afford an easy remedy by this *slight concession*. The Council Office cannot depart from a course which *they consider* the only proper way of administering the public grants[4]. There is no such free-handed "liberality" in this world as that which deals with other people's rights. It is an "injustice" to the Dissenter that the Church should found a school where he is not able to rival her; but it is only a "slight concession," for the Church to give security for Dissent in her own schools!

It happened, however, that the place selected for the first experiment was absolutely clear from the pretended injustice. The Welsh town of Llanelly—chosen to be the *vile corpus*—had a majority of Dissenters in its population, and no less than four British and Foreign Schools, affording ample accommodation for all who approved of that system. The Church applied for a grant on the ordinary conditions of a National School. The Committee of Council consulted the secretary of the existing British Schools, and his schools not being full he *liberally* denied the necessity for a National School! The Church people, having, of course, no conscience, could afford the "slight concession" of sending their children to be educated with the Dissenters. Lord Russell, who is an eminent champion of civil and religious liberty, is satisfied that the British and Foreign system is the best, and what can any one wish for more? The "promoters," however, having complied with all known conditions—secured their site

[4] Letter to J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P., 17th Nov., 1864. Pamphlet, p. 23.

and subscribed their money—were unreasonable enough to press their right to a grant of their own.

This was the case which Mr. Lingen first selected for a Conscience clause. His suggestion was tamely submitted to, *and immediately he demanded the further* "concession" *of the clause proposed by the Department itself in* 1849, *whereby Dissenters were excluded from the School Committee.* To have relinquished this last security would in effect have converted the design into a *fifth* British and Foreign School. So, after being hunted through three years of hateful correspondence, the promoters rejected the proposal, and the grant was refused, 16th May, 1860. So far "my Lords" had only obstructed instead of aiding the progress of education. But what has happened since? A genuine Church school is now erecting at Llanelly, without any "public money." Mr. Lonsdale says that many similar cases have come to his knowledge. The Conscience clause has really been introduced in only a few cases; twenty or thirty came under his knowledge in the last year in which the grant was declined in preference, and the applications to the National Society, apart from the Committee of Council, have increased very much during the last three or four years[5].

Lord Granville serenely regards this ostracism of the very teaching for which the public money was really voted, as "a perfectly legitimate alternative:" but if State aid is to be reserved exclusively for Dissenters, and the National Society be left alone to meet the wants of the Church, it would be fairer and better to abolish the grants altogether.

It must never be forgotten that this Llanelly case (the first of all) exhibited none of the conditions on which the Conscience clause is now defended before the public. There was no Dissenting minority to be protected; the Dissenters had more school-room than they occupied. The Church asked for aid to build for her own children, and it was denied, except on condition of depriving the new school of all Church character. How is this result to be reconciled with Lord Granville's letter to Mr. Hubbard, dated 17th November, 1864, which states that "if the parish *was* (*sic*) composed entirely of members of the Church of England, or if it *was* sufficiently populous for two schools, and the grant asked was only for a school sufficient to accommodate the children of parents belonging to the Church of England (the precise case of Llanelly) there would be no difficulty in meeting the ordinary conditions of a National School by a grant." Why, twelve

[5] Select Com. Ev., Q. 1587—9.

months before the date of this letter, Mr. Lingen had written to the National Society proposing to *alter* its terms of union, expressly to subvert "the ordinary conditions of a National School." The Society having refused his proposal, the correspondence was closed by a solemn objurgation of its principles on the part of their lordships, and conditions have been ever since imposed on building grants, the acceptance of which, *ipso facto*, deprives the school of its union with the National Society and the Diocesan Board[6].

In the face of this open breach with the Church, Mr. Lingen persists in affirming that their lordships have not changed the principles upon which their grants for building schools are administered. Whence, then, the present rupture with the National Society? The Society has not changed; it has refused to change when pressed to do so by the Committee of Council. Its terms of union, now declared incompatible with justice, are the same as in 1838, when Parliament resolved to employ its agency, and hesitated to admit any other. The Society submitted to the Management clauses devised by the Committee of Council in 1848—52. There was remonstrance, but no rupture, till Mr. Lingen proposed his Conscience clause on the 27th November, 1863, and acknowledged it to be inconsistent with the terms of union, by asking for an alteration in the Society's Charter. Nothing could so palpably demonstrate the change of principle in the Council Office as the change of relations with the National Society. They are exactly reversed since 1858. *Then* it was the condition of the great majority of grants, that the school should be for ever in union with the National Society. *Now* the same union is in some cases, and threatens to become in all, a disqualification for any grant. *Then* all parties were allowed to claim building-grants with regard to their own wants, and without reference to the wants of the other. *Now* this privilege is allowed to the British and Foreign School Society only. When the Church applies for a National School, the grant is made dependent on the wants of the Dissenters. If the Committee of Council decide that only one school is admissible, the Church shall not be allowed a grant unless she undertakes to educate Dissenters, and educate them in their own views. It is not enough to say, as the British and Foreign Schools say, that any one may come on condition of attending the instruction of the school from the

[6] Case of Barbourne, S. Stephens. Parl. Paper, House of Commons, 1864. No. 315. Quoted by Mr. Hubbard in his excellent Pamphlet, "The Conscience Clause of the Education Department." Masters, 1865.

beginning of the day to the end of it[7]. It is not enough for the promoters of a National School to promise—what Dissenters never promise—that the religious views of others shall be respected as far as is consistent with the discipline of the school. This is actually done in the great majority of National Schools, and no complaint has been established against them. We are required to give a *legal right* to the Dissenting parent—which is not possessed by the Church parent—of sending his child to the school, with a control over the religious instruction which we feel to be incompatible with the free exercise of our own conscience. This is the modest demand of the Conscience clause as it stands.

Mr. Lingen would justify it to the National Society by this "dilemma:"—"To help, with public money, to build a National School large enough for the whole population of such a parish, leaves the Dissenters exposed to a violation of their religious rights; and to help to build such a school, large enough for the Church people only of such a parish, leaves the Dissenters without education" (7th May, 1864). But this "public money" is the produce of taxes paid by both classes indiscriminately, on condition of receiving it back in grants proportioned to their needs and exertions. Is it a religious right of the Dissenter to share on his own terms in the grants earned by the voluntary expenditure of the Church? And is it no violation of the religious rights of the Church to be denied a grant proportionate to her own contributions, because the Dissenters are not numerous enough to qualify for another? How are the religious rights of Dissenters secured, by withholding a grant from the only qualified party, and leaving the parish without a school at all? This has been the result in many cases: Mr. Lowe tells us he is better pleased with it than with submission to the Conscience clause. But the Committee of Council was appointed to promote education by spending the public money, not to stifle educational efforts by saving it.

It may be asked, why not apply their "dilemma" to the case of the small parishes which, though taxed to supply the "public money," are unable to qualify for a grant under the existing rules? It is no violation of *their* religious rights, to insist on certificated teachers, though the effect is to confine the public money to the wealthier districts, and leave the poorer without education. Mr. Lingen is content to say, that the

[7] Evidence of E. D. I. Wilks, Esq.: "They attend the teaching of the school from the beginning of the day to the end."—Sel. Com. Ev., Q. 3646.

grants can only be made to those who qualify under the rules, and that others must take their chance. Lord Russell has "no doubt that the inevitable result of a denominational system is that many parts of the country, and a considerable portion of the population, must fail to receive any assistance from the State[8]." It is only when this result touches a small Dissenting minority, that a new rule is invented to restrain the religious teaching of the Church as a protection to Dissent. To say that the same rule is applicable to Dissenting schools, is a fallacy; it may be inserted in some trust-deeds, but Mr. Wilks expressly states of the British and Foreign Schools that, "from their system of teaching, the question of a Conscience clause can never arise[9]." A rule simply against dogma can have no application where dogmatic teaching is not used. The only dogmatic system besides our own is found in the Roman Catholic schools, *and on them no Conscience clause is imposed.* The rule of equal application was the old rule, which allowed all to establish their schools on their own principles, and admitted no interference from another. Conscience may be as deeply interested in upholding dogma under one system, as in proscribing it under another; yet, the pretended Conscience clause enables the Dissenter to proscribe dogma in the Church school, while it suffers no interference of any kind in the Dissenting school. To be impartial, it should enable the Church parent to demand instruction in the Catechism, or the unbelieving parent to proscribe the Bible, in the British and Foreign School. This it never does. It is a rule to enable a Dissenter to walk into a National School and interdict the teaching for which it was principally founded, while it never touches with one of its fingers any part of the British and Foreign system.

The injustice is aggravated by the intolerable ambiguity of the rule. It has never been submitted to Parliament, never reduced to a minute, never promulgated in any shape to which the Department can be pinned down. Mr. Lingen puts it to the National Society as applying only to places where but one school can be maintained—*i.e.*, where the population will not yield more than 150 children. In the first place, however, this was not the case at Llanelly. In the next place, more than half the parishes of England fall under this description, and the figure is preposterously high. Excellent schools may be supported with half the number of children, and very fair ones with a quarter. It is true that small schools are more costly *to the promoters*, and more troublesome to the inspectors, than large

[8] Sel. Com. Ev., 3014. [9] Ibid., 3544.

ones, but they are not so "onerous to the State," or so necessarily inefficient as to justify an interference with the religious instruction. Then, again, in these small populations, the Department is not content with the ordinary criterion of Dissent—attendance at some Dissenting chapel—but reverses the rule, and requires the Church population to be counted from those who attend church. Even then the injustice is not complete. It is not only that the Church is not allowed to count the whole population when a portion is Dissenting; but where the Church population of itself is sufficient for a school, and the Dissenting population is not, the Church shall not have a grant for her own children unless she will take in the Dissenters with a Conscience clause! There are even cases in which grants were refused, though every householder in the parish signed the application [1]. The Council Office seems to have thought it their duty to rebuke the "spiritless outcasts" who would not ask for a Conscience clause, and to protect the more zealous Dissenters yet unborn.

All these questions are settled in the Education Department, as in Bokhara, by the good pleasure of the reigning Sultan. Sultan Lowe was inexorable, but Sultan Bruce is considerate enough (when the clergyman proves intractable) to "ask himself whether it is worth while, for the sake of a very few, to inflict on the parish the great misfortune of being left without a school [2]. He even confesses that he would rather see the 150 children in two schools than in no school at all [3]. "He took the number as he found it, but admits that the practice cannot be logically defended, and the whole system is very indefinite and vague." Lord Granville has nothing better to say of it; "the position is imperfect and anomalous even now." Yet this partial and ambiguous theory, which no one justifies or even pretends to understand, has been allowed to alienate the National Society, with the mass of the clergy, and so impede the education of the poor to an enormous extent. "Sixty thousand pounds have been *saved* in two years by the repulsive efficacy of the Conscience clause. Sixty thousand pounds represents grants for schools for sixty thousand children. Sixty thousand children have been deprived of education, so far as the Conscience clause could effect its purpose [4]." If they have not been deprived absolutely, it has been from the zeal and liberality of the clergy in persisting to build schools without the grant to which they were justly entitled. For be it observed that in no case, *ex hypothesi*, were the Dissenters com-

[1] Ev., 1516—1524; also 1664. [2] Ibid., 922.
[3] Ibid., 930, 914, 932. [4] Mr. Hubbard's "Conscience Clause," p. 34.

petent to supply the deficiency. Truly this is a heavy price to pay for "protection to Dissent."

Neither have we yet reached the bottom of this reactionary policy. It is admitted that the clause is not yet "reasonable." Lord Granville is only waiting till he has "conciliated the Church" (!)—which means till the screw has been got on a sufficient number of Church schools—to propose to Parliament a development of the "principle" beyond any thing which has been yet disclosed, save in the scheme of Lord John Russell, *withdrawn* in 1839. It is manifest that Lord Granville's principle really belongs to the scheme then proposed and rejected. If it be "unjust" to Dissenters to allow the Church a grant for sixty children of her own without seating forty young Dissenters on her back, the injustice is not removed when the forty is reduced to ten, to twenty, or to one. Conscience is an individual right; like life, it is not subject to averages. You shed more blood in killing ten men than one, but one makes a murder. It is as "unjust" to outrage one conscience as a thousand. Again, if it be "unjust" to deny a Dissenter rights in a Church school, where he is the only Dissenter in the parish, it is equally so where there are a hundred more. Why is he to be obliged to unite with them in building a new school, when it is cheaper and pleasanter to demand "justice" from the Church school? Suppose he has no money, or does not choose to spend it, or likes the Church school better. He has always a right to "justice," and no principle can be suggested to entitle any Dissenter, as a matter of justice and conscience, to admission to any Church school, which will not entitle all Dissenters to admission to all Church schools at their pleasure. The principle insisted upon by Lord Granville is the receipt of public money, and that applies alike to all.

Then observe what follows: Lord Granville was right in saying that "the two things (annual grants and building grants) do not stand exactly on the same foundation:" but, on his principle, the Dissenters' claim is even stronger on the annual grant than the building grant; for this is a perpetual subsidy of public money in proportion to the payments and study of the children themselves; consequently, his lordship necessarily adds, that "a really satisfactory measure would comprise both." The difficulty however is this: that the "really satisfactory measure" would, in all existing National schools, impose as a condition of the *annual* grant the violation of the Management clause, which the same Department has made the condition of the *building* grant. This might bring the managers into Chancery,

and afford a new field for maintaining that "my Lords have not changed the principles on which their grants are administered." Still we must do justice, though the sky falls; and it is not obscurely intimated that Parliament may be asked to untie this knot[5].

The "principle," however, cannot stop at Church schools, nor with creeds and formularies. It reaches to all "religious instruction" which the *Cives Romanus* conscientiously objects to. Will it allow the Bible to be "enforced" when the Catechism is optional? If the Ten Commandments cannot be insisted on as part of the Catechism, can the same words be enforced as part of the Bible? Roman Catholics, Jews, Mormons, and Unitarians are *Cives Romani*, all taxed, as well as orthodox Dissenters. Suppose they object to the English Version of the Scriptures?

After discarding the Catechism, Creed, and Liturgy of the Established Church, we can hardly have a new State religion manufactured out of the letter of the English Version, and the private comments of the teacher for the day, Churchman, Wesleyan, Independent, Quaker, or Baptist. If this is to be the result, the Conscience clause is simply a device to elevate the British and Foreign School system to a supremacy over that of the National Society and the Church. If "the clause is to be carried out to the full extent of the principle it involves," it lands us exactly in that "godless" system of State education which Parliament and the country resolutely repudiated in 1839.

There is no escaping this conclusion so long as *State-aided* schools are confounded with *State* schools. In reality there are no State schools in England (at least out of the gaols and workhouses); that was the point decided by Parliament and the country in 1839. The schools are the property of the managers under the trusts of their several Societies. The State has no property in them, consequently no individual in right of the State; the State aids them all, on conditions drawn up expressly to exclude such rights. The Church and the Denominations are each to spread its own banquet, and "Conscience" may take which it likes; but Conscience cannot sit at one table and demand the food of another. Conscience cannot lay hands on its neighbour's money to save its own. Conscience has no more right in the school of a different religious body, than it has in the Foreign Office or the captain's cabin of a man-of-war.

[5] *Fortnightly Review*, p. 171.

This kind of conscience is, in fact, nothing but the old idea, withdrawn in 1839 but again peeping out of the Council Office pigeon-holes, in quest of the "greater concurrence of opinion" then modestly prophesied. Lord Granville has now "great hope of being able to conduct some negotiations to a satisfactory point[6]." His hopes are certainly not sustained by the attitude of the National Society, and the evidence given by Mr. Lonsdale of the increasing opposition of the clergy and school managers. But experience has shown that the Committee of Council is never so much to be feared as when "conducting a negotiation." In the open field the Church will hold her own; all our slips—and they have at times been very perilous—have occurred to deputations candidly gossiping with the unostentatious, reticent, Department in Whitehall. Lord Granville and Mr. Lowe, at all events, have spoken out. We know what is before us, and there can be no excuse for drifting or being drawn into it.

There is little interest in discussing the terms of a rule acknowledged to be imperfect and tentative. The Conscience clause of 1859 is already on its way down the sliding-scale after the Management clauses of 1849, and the Trust deeds of 1839. The rule of the next decade, though pretty plainly shadowed on the wall, is still withdrawn from our grasp. Still, it would be cynical to write a paper on the Conscience clause in which no such formulary should appear. Somewhat, too, requires to be added on the practical working of the proposition as it stands.

As proposed to the National Society, in Mr. Lingen's letter of the 22nd November, 1863, the clause is worded thus:—"The Committee shall be bound to make such orders as shall provide for admitting to the benefits of the school the children of parents not in communion with the Church; but such orders shall be confined to the exemption of such children, if their parents desire it, from attendance at the public worship, and from instruction in the doctrine or formularies of the said Church, and shall not otherwise interfere with the religious teaching of the scholars as fixed (as the case may be), and shall not authorize any other religious instruction to be given in the school."

The first and perhaps greatest difficulty in dealing with this clause, is to *parse* it. An inspector might despair of unravelling the tangle which requires "orders for admitting" to be "confined to the exemption," &c. Again, neither friends nor

[6] Sel. Com. Ev., 1934.

foes agree on the grammatical construction of the concluding proviso respecting "*other* religious instruction." Apart from verbal obscurities, the clause is *primâ facie* objectionable as confessedly a mere mask. Neither the terms, nor the application are meant to be final. If acceded to, it is to be followed by a further demand, *as was the case at Llanelly*. If shown to be mischievous, we are answered: "Well, that was not the *intention;* agree with us in the principle, and the terms can be settled afterwards." Meantime, the "terms" continue to be pressed as they stand; and the "principle" is either what Lord Granville lays down, or it is still shrouded in "the policy of reticence."

We are told, indeed, that the "principle" is already conceded, in not requiring every child in every National School to learn the Catechism. If any one child is exempted from any part of the Church teaching on any consideration, we have conceded the principle; and in return for our liberality, we are expected to swallow this clause without further scruple. But surely this argument may be retorted: "If we have conceded what you want, why are you asking for more? Why peril the whole system for results which must inevitably work themselves out if really contained in the admitted 'principle?'" It is clear from the heat of the controversy, that the principle is *not* agreed upon; and in such a case the only safe course is to keep close to the letter of the demand. In the Committee of the House of Commons, both querists and respondents came to grief from neglecting this precaution. Mr. Canon Robinson created some merriment by confessing that "he did not know the wording of the clause" which he came forward to defend[7]! Yet Sir John Pakington showed himself equally at sea, and was almost angry with Mr. Fagan, who has "studied them over and over again," for taking the words as they stand, in preference to Sir John's mistaken impression of them.

The best way to disperse these shadows is to take the clumsy clause to pieces, and to examine its requirements point by point. In doing this I will contrast the corresponding operation of the "Happy Arrangement" under which the National Schools are now, for the most part, conducted.

THE CONSCIENCE CLAUSE.	THE HAPPY ARRANGEMENT.
1. Begins by dividing the population into persons "within,	1. Eschews all "ticketing," asks no unnecessary questions,

[7] Ev., Q. 6031: "I do not know the wording of the Conscience clause, therefore I can only give an impression as to its purport."

the communion of the Church," and persons "without her communion," *i.e.*, stereotypes and exasperates religious differences. No legal definition of these classes.

2. Includes in the protected class not only orthodox Dissenters and Roman Catholics, but Jews, Mormons, Mohammedans, Unitarians, and Secularists. Impossible to unite these in one religious teaching.

3. Dispenses with attendance at church "if the parents desire it." No other condition.

4. Prohibits (under the same condition) instruction in the "doctrine" of the Church; not in "particular doctrines," but *the* entire doctrine, *i.e.*, all Christianity.

5. Prohibits (under the same condition) the "formularies" of the Church; *i.e.*, again *all* the formularies, Creed, LORD'S Prayer, and Commandments, as well as Catechism: carried to its full extent (as it must be) this "principle" will drive out the Bible[8].

6. Deprives the children to whom it is applied of all religious instruction, and so establishes a Secular Department in the school.

calls no man a Dissenter till he calls himself so, and takes every one with it who does not refuse to go.

2. Admits all whose religious views can be respected without confusion, but declines those whose requirements are too divergent to be reconciled with the teaching of the school.

3. Allows all children to attend public worship with their parents; would *not* allow them to be kept at home at work, or taken to Socialist or Secular lectures, or other desecration of the LORD'S Day.

4. Respects parental wishes, but insists in every case on an effective Christian and moral teaching.

5. Allows for scruples without injury to the religious discipline of the school. Exemptions few and rarely claimed. No exemptions from school prayers, hymns, or Bible lessons.

6. Secures to every child a sound Christian education.

[8] Mr. Lingen acknowledges, in answer to Mr. Caparn, that the Apostles' Creed is a Formulary that may be interdicted. This distinctly shows that the schools could be no longer limited to *Christians*. He avoids the ques-

The last proviso is indeed stoutly contested. Mr. Lingen writes (Nat. Soc., 4th Jan., 1864) that the clause "is not *intended* to preclude any religious instruction which the parents are willing the child should receive." This is also Sir John Pakington's interpretation; if it could be got out of the words, it would place the clergyman, as Mr. Fagan observes, in the condition of "teaching Wesleyanism, Socinianism, or any thing else." This would be so manifestly intolerant, that Mr. Bruce rejects the interpretation. "What is there (he asks) in the Conscience clause which requires you to give such religious education as the parents think fit?" Certainly *nothing*. Mr. Lingen contradicts himself; he says, "The object of the clause is twofold—1. To guard the religious instruction of Church of England schools in its entirety from all interference; 2. To provide for the instruction of the children of Dissenting parents," &c[9]. But if the Dissenting parents are to shut out a part, and retain a part, of the Church instruction, how is it "guarded in its entirety from all interference?" The religious teaching, as fixed by the Trust deed of a National School, comprises three requisites, the Bible, the Catechism, and the Liturgy. If the parent may interdict two parts and leave the third, the religious teaching in this case is exchanged for that of a British and Foreign School.

Nor is this all. The Bible may be read, only "so long as the text is not employed to enforce doctrine which is that of the Church, but is not also that of the parent[1]." What is this but to "teach Wesleyanism, Socinianism, or any thing else?" It is certainly another religious instruction from that of the Church. In a later letter[2] Mr. Lingen endeavours to escape from the dilemma, by pointing out that this result occurs only in the "exceptional cases," and that with the other scholars the Church doctrine must be maintained. The "exceptional" however are *all* the cases in which the Conscience clause takes effect; the others are those to which it does not apply. According to this letter, therefore, the clause requires two systems of religious instruction in every Church school where it is introduced, one "fixed" and dogmatic, the other "exceptional" and latitudinarian; one that of the National Society, the other that of the British and Foreign School Society.

tion with respect to the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, yet they are clearly "formularies," though *verbatim* in the Bible: and if not, their meaning may be shut out under the head of "doctrine."

[9] Letter to Rev. W. B. Caparn, 31st May, 1865.

[1] Ibid.

[2] To Rev. C. Craven, 29th Jan., 1866. *Guardian*, 31st Jan., 1866.

My Lords may well "decline to prescribe the details" by which managers are to satisfy the provisions of such a clause: for besides the impossibility, the clause itself expressly forbids any other religious instruction, in any case, but that of the Church.

It is quite in vain to struggle against the plain logical meaning of the clause. It creates for the exceptional cases a Secular department and nothing else. It excludes, as the Dean of Ely points out, "all religious truth." And Mr. Wilks settles the question by stating the matter of fact, that, "so far as the week-day schools are concerned (the only schools to which the clause applies), the children who take advantage of the Conscience clause *are educated entirely without religion*[3]." This fundamental requisite, without which no school is entitled to any grant at all, is relegated, he admits, "to Sabbath Schools and so on;" in other words, to chance; at all events to agencies outside the purview of the Committee of Council.

Returning, then, to our contrast: can any one pretend it does not exhibit differences enough to justify the upholders of the one in the most strenuous resistance of the other? On one side is an established practice, liberal, flexible, and effective, carrying conciliation to the verge of safety, and ceasing only when conciliation is impracticable. On the other hand we are menaced by a hard, pedantic theory, bristling with difficulties, and with no power of practical solution.

When my Lords are pressed with these difficulties;—when they are told that their clause would allow a "Universalist" to interdict the doctrine of hell-fire; a "Unitarian," the Deity of CHRIST, the Atonement, and the Personality of the HOLY GHOST; a "Rationalist," the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; a "Nothingarian," the very existence of GOD; it might have been added, a Mormon, to proscribe the Seventh Commandment, and a Sunday Leaguer, the Fourth; and each to demand religious instruction *minus* his particular aversion;—they complain of our putting "extreme cases *ad invidiam:* in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the parent's scruples will be satisfied if his child be left free to go to his own place of worship, Sunday School, &c." But this is just what *we* complain of. We say that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the parents are satisfied already. The Conscience clause is invented for nothing else but extreme cases. The "charity and common sense" which are (somewhat *ad invidiam*) recommended to managers, had already met the difficulty in the ninety-nine cases, when all was unsettled by this clause,

[3] Sel. Com. Ev., 3601—3.

invented for the sake of the hundredth. In insinuating that the children are too young to require dogmatic teaching, their lordships forget that their remark is quite as applicable to Dissenting "scruples" as to Church dogma. One does not know why Baptists or Wesleyans need inculcate "propositions of theology or Church government" at a tenderer age than Churchmen; but we do know that the Church of England requires all baptized children to be taught the Catechism before they are confirmed, and to promote this instruction is the chief object of a National School.

If the Education Department had been content with charity and common sense, this controversy would never have arisen; and if a practical adjustment of the difficulties were even now the object in view (apart from political capital) it need not be long continued. For these are precisely the features of the existing "happy arrangement." Its excellence lies entirely in that of which the Education Department seeks to deprive it. Like most working systems in this country, it is voluntary and self-adjusting; the Conscience clause would make it compulsory and perilous. At present the National School is a Church school: the Dissenter sends his child as long as his conscience can keep the peace with our conscience. When the divergency is too great, we can do him no good, and he had better leave us. This is practical and Christian. Under the Conscience clause the school is claimed as a State school; the parent lays down his objections, and proscribes what he pleases *ex cathedrâ*. The managers are turned into servants, and servants of two or more masters: the clergyman naturally refuses to be dictated to; and there is necessarily an explosion. The only answer is, that *perhaps* the result will not be so bad in practice, that the clause will only be claimed in a few cases, and the clergyman will be enabled to get over the difficulty somehow. That is to say, we are asked to put the staff out of our own hand into the hand of an opponent, in the hope that he will not hit often or hard, and if he should, that perhaps we can still defend ourselves.

The latest form of Conscience clause is proposed by the Dean of Ely, anxious to satisfy the demands of the State, yet deeming it "clear that the Conscience clause actually in use cannot be defended." The Dean knows the advantages of the Happy Arrangement; but "when this general and easily understood engagement is crystallized into a formula, it almost certainly involves the difficulties which beset the existing Conscience clause. If the doctrines of the Church of England are to be excluded, all religious truth must be excluded: if the *peculiar*

doctrines alone are to be excluded, then what are the peculiar doctrines?"

Here is the old dilemma repeated from another side. In a Church school, and with respect to the religious instruction, where is the middle line between Church teaching and no teaching? The Dean is not sanguine of having hit the mark. The following is his proposal:—"The School Committee shall be bound to make, from *time to time*, such orders as shall seem *to them* necessary and sufficient, for the admission into the school of children whose parents do not conform to the Church of England as by law established: but such orders shall in no way interfere with the full education in the principles of the Established Church of those children whose parents are in communion with the same; and it shall be assumed that a child admitted to the school is to be educated in the principles of the Established Church, unless an objection be made by the parents in writing." Dr. Goodwin rests the merit of his proposal on the "indefiniteness" which he thinks essential to a satisfactory formula. He contemplates different rules in different places, suited to each particular case, instead of one unbending law like Mr. Lingen's, which he sees clearly could be turned against the whole religious discipline of the school. In a word, the Dean of Ely looks for the remedy (as all practical men do) to the discretion of the managers, not the control of the parent. His clause differs from the existing Happy Arrangement only in vesting the discretion in the committee instead of the minister; and that being so, the Dean seems to fall between two stools. On one side, he will be told his formula is no Conscience clause at all, because it gives no absolute right to the parent; on the other, that the National School authorities have already done all that can be done, in leaving the question to the discretion of the minister, who is the fittest person to exercise it. If any thing more "definite," *i.e.*, more binding, were attempted, it would fail on the Dean's own showing; for the rest of his clause (though drawn in far better English) contains nothing to remove the difficulties which he acknowledges to beset Mr. Lingen's. The redeeming feature of Dr. Goodwin's rule is, that it is no rule at all;—it binds no longer than it proves convenient and feasible. This is perfectly right, but when no one is to be bound, it is better, perhaps, not to legislate; just as the best, though by no means the commonest, way of saying nothing, is to hold your tongue.

From the struggles of a mind like Dr. Goodwin's, it is at once curious and instructive to turn to the self-complacency of men who probably never catechized a class in their lives, and might

be puzzled to describe the distinction between a Sunday School and a Day School. Sir John Pakington, who seems quite ruffled at the phenomenon of a Churchmanship independent of Conservative leaders, is consoled by the Lord President in this way:—"I have not the slightest doubt that the Right Honourable Baronet and myself might settle *in a very few minutes* a plan which would be perfectly satisfactory to us both, and which I should think just and reasonable; but without putting it at all in an invidious manner as regards religious prejudices, I think that you will very often find that you cannot have strong religious feelings without there being religious prejudices at the same time. I am referring to the difficulty of framing a measure which would be perfectly satisfactory to the religious feelings of the different sects[4]." How sublimely these distinguished statesmen look down on convictions which have carried such small fry as Apostles and martyrs to the stake, and to some millions of Christians still seem vastly more important than Lords or Commons, ribands blue, or ribands red! We have heard of another noble lord who "without the slightest doubt, and in a very few minutes," would assume the charge of the Channel Fleet, or of a patient in Guy's Hospital, and in a manner perfectly satisfactory to himself—if not to the victims. But Lord Melbourne was wont to test the heroism of his Cabinet by another criterion, "*Could not you let it alone?*"

Never was so perilous a disturbance of difficult relations attempted with so little call. There were absolutely *no* complaints! The secretary of the British and Foreign School Society, when asked if he knew any cases in which hardship and injustice have arisen from the want of a Conscience clause, replies, "I cannot call to mind at this moment particular cases;" and again he repeats, "*I could not call to mind at this moment any such case*[5]." Yet this gentleman has devoted twenty years to the subject of elementary education among the poor, and (theoretically) supports the clause. Dr. Temple, with less practical knowledge, is "*sure* that a great deal of injustice is done of *which you know nothing*, of which the Government and the House of Commons are not in the least aware, because the people who suffer from it are not of the rank whose complaints reach you. In many cases parents have no other school to which they can send their children, and they are obliged *therefore* to have them taught what they disapprove; but in many cases also they suffer an injustice which they feel very much more keenly, in that they are

[4] Ev., Q. 1928. [5] Sel. Com., 3547—3598.

required to send their children to church instead of taking them where they are in the habit of going themselves, namely, to the Dissenting chapel." It is impossible not to observe how largely Dr. Temple here draws on his opinion of what *must* be, rather than his knowledge of what *is*. The only fact deposed to is, that he can remember cases in Worcestershire, Devonshire, and Oxfordshire, where children were excluded from schools on account of their religious belief: he does not specify the kind of belief. He admits that the majority of the clergy act on the Happy Arrangement, which the cant of the Department styles "the principle of the Conscience clause," but he thinks a considerable minority do not.

In the expression of this opinion Dr. Temple stands alone, and one cannot but regret the absence of Lord Robert Cecil, whose searching cross-examination brought out so many fresh lights in the testimony of Mr. Wilks and Canon Robinson. Certainly Archdeacon Denison speaks of himself as in a very small minority; and if any one point is established before the Committee it is the conciliatory, and as some witnesses think too conciliatory, spirit in which the clergy exercise their discretion under the existing rules of the National Society. Their views may not be in all respects so "broad" as Dr. Temple would desire; but surely something more tangible than his rhetorical grievance is needed, to justify the State in driving them out of their schools.

It is not the character of Dissent, as we know it in Yorkshire, that it "never tells its grief;" the rank must be obscure indeed from which the cry of injustice cannot reach the Government and the House of Commons! Depend upon it, if any one presentable grievance could have been routed out in the remotest village, Mr. Wilks would be sure to have heard of it. The Council Office—every one—would have heard of it. The difficulty is to conceive how any one should miss hearing of it, with 546,000,000 of newspapers keeping daily and weekly watch over outraged consciences, and their readers ever ready to console persecution with a penny subscription.

But while there was little need to interfere, there was every reason to abstain from interference. Never was a time when religious men were less disposed to accept State intermeddling. The decay of political parties has directed the national earnestness to questions of higher moment. Indications are not wanting of another great battle between Revelation and Infidelity. The Church, thrown upon her own resources, and daily acquiring more confidence in them, is less and less disposed to traffic for State support. In our

controversies of the last thirty years, nothing has been so remarkable as the unanimity with which all parties deprecated an appeal to the State Legislature; and of all State departments the Privy Council is universally the most disliked and suspected. It has beaten the Ecclesiastical Commissioners hollow in the race for unpopularity. Presided over by one of the most courteous and accomplished members of the House of Lords, with a staff of University men without parallel in any other office, administering nearly a million a year in aid of the object of deepest interest to the clergy, and in relief of their own overburdened resources, the Education Department has managed to make itself utterly odious to the very men whose unpaid co-operation they were most bound to conciliate. If any proof were needed how little education lies in scholarship, it would be that at such a crisis;—when all parties are recoiling from the old conception of the union between Church and State—this pedantic bureau comes coolly forward to ask the National Society to alter its charter (!) and being of course refused, lectures the Archbishop of Canterbury and the bench of Bishops on the Church's duty in the education of the poor!

To make the matter worse, the Department was at that moment in presence of another question which menaces, if it cannot be solved, the speedy overthrow of the whole system. The 11,000 parishes, excluded by mere Departmental rules from any share in the grants raised by common taxation, will no longer submit to an "injustice" which the Revised Code has left without the shadow of an excuse. Instead of concentrating all their energies on a grievance affecting 4,000,000 of people, the Council Office perversely went in search of the insignificant fraction of Dissent labouring under the want of a Conscience clause[6]. They were asked for an egg, and they offered a scorpion!

To withdraw this "Conscience clause" altogether, and permit the "Happy Arrangement" to work itself out on the basis of "charity and common sense," is a part too lofty to be expected from those who have created the controversy. And after the continued tamperings to which the settlement of 1839 has been subjected in the Council Office, it is very desirable to secure an arrangement which may dispose of this vexatious question for ever. If the Committee of Council are in any degree animated by the spirit recommended to others in their letter to

[6] Mr. Bruce regards these two disputes as the instances which mainly keep "the Education question unsettled," and so render it necessary to "continue the present (imperfect) constitution of the office."—Ev. 856, 857. Is it possible that this continuance is the object of some of the "officers?"

Mr. Craven—if they are content to deal with the practical wants of ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, and leave alone "the extreme cases which are of force only *ad invidiam*"—the remedy does not seem far to seek. A Conscience clause in our Trust-deeds is impossible. The Dean of Ely's failure ought to show that. It is faulty in the very conception and principle of its being. It is a clause in the trust-deed of a voluntary charity, to secure to certain persons a right to oppose the designs of the promoters in their own house. It is a device to make the clergyman of the parish countenance, in his own school, the erroneous and strange doctrines which his ordination vows bind him to banish and drive away. Neither sophistry nor blandishments can delude the Church on this point. It is an outrage on civil and religious liberty attempted on no other class, and must be resisted to the last. Better a thousand times that the grants be withdrawn, than that the Church should withdraw her protest against heresy, and the parish priest stand paltering with a double tongue in the presence of little children.

Next to this cardinal vice, the Conscience clause sins in compelling the parish priest to *ticket* his parishioners, and that by a test on which we are by no means agreed. There is no authorized criterion of Dissent. The Committee of Council call all who do not attend church, Dissenters; a genuine parish priest will separate none but the excommunicate.

Thirdly; the Conscience clause offends by interfering with the daily religious instruction, and thus, in spite of all explanations, hindering the clergyman in the very work he comes to perform. Nothing can come of such interference but a weakening of all religious teaching, and finally Secularism. The clergy will never agree to it; and the evidence before Sir John Pakington's Committee shows it to be wholly unnecessary. *No single case was adduced in which any parent asked for it.* So far as experience goes, in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, the Dissenting scruple is satisfied by taking the child to its own place of worship and Sunday School. Now if the Committee of Council would consent to let the Dissenters tell their own grievance, a settlement seems to be feasible. There is no occasion to thrust forward the Dissenting conscience; it is good for all parents to take their children with them to church, and to teach them GOD'S truth on the LORD'S Day. No English priest ever pretends to more than to supplement the defects of those who cannot, or will not, discharge this parental office.

All that is necessary is to pass an Act of Parliament to this effect, and leave the Trust-deeds to their proper purpose. Leave the

Church uncompromised and the clergyman unfettered. Let the Dissenting conscience be supreme in its proper sphere; but not flattered, not invested with special recognition, not privileged to domineer over the consciences of others. The following is such a Bill as would satisfy these conditions, and probably meet with no opposition from the Church:—

"Whereas it is expedient to remove doubts with respect to the religious instruction in schools receiving grants from the State for the education of the poor; Be it enacted, &c.—

"1. That no such grant shall be made to any school in England or Wales (not being intended for children of the Jewish persuasion) until provision shall have been made in the Trust-deed for the instruction of all the scholars in the Holy Scriptures, and their attendance at Public Worship on the LORD'S Day.

"2. That it shall be competent to the founder or managers of any school to provide such further religious instruction, as they shall think fit and necessary, and their regulations herein shall in no way be questioned or interfered with on the part of the State.

"3. Provided always that no child attending a day school in receipt of a grant shall be bound to attend the Sunday School or place of worship appointed by the founder or managers, if the parent or guardian shall have engaged in writing to provide for such child's attendance at public worship and proper instruction on the LORD'S Day. And if any child be excluded from any of the benefits of the day school by reason of the non-attendance on Sunday so occasioned by the parent, the school shall forfeit the grant for that year."

In offering this suggestion, I do not admit for a moment that it lies with the opponents of the Conscience clause to find an alternative. We want *every* child to receive the Church teaching; it is no business of ours to devise contrivances for escaping it. This whole system of Grants was established by the State against the remonstrances of the Church, and has always been administered in the interest of Dissent. The present grievance is purely the manufacture of the State bureau; it lies with them to settle the question they have raised. What I say is, that such an Act of Parliament would accomplish all that we have any evidence is desired by Dissenters, without invading the liberties of the Church. A Conscience clause in our own Trust-deeds is a direct bargain by the clergyman not to teach GOD'S truth as he knows it. No one who has accepted such a clause has a right to insist upon any dogma, or article of the faith, in the pulpit or any where else. For has he not made provision for

teaching little children the opposite in his own school, and bound himself and his successors not to show them the truth?

But an Act of Parliament would simply lay down its conditions, and leave the Church to her own course. The parish priest would have made no bargain with error. He would be free to teach and insist on the truth; free to persuade by all the means in his power, both parent and child to attend the parish church and his own Sunday School. If they *will not* come, he at least is clear. On the other hand, the Dissenter might get what he wants, so far as we know it. He would not be able to harass other people's consciences, but there would be perfect liberty to his own. If this is not enough, there is clearly no alternative but to withdraw the Grants altogether and abolish Mr. Lingen: after all, this may very probably be the better course.

GEORGE TREVOR.

P.S.—Since this Article was in type, I have seen a similar suggestion made by the Rev. Canon Norris at the Norwich Church Congress. He would however (apparently) insert the Clause so altered in the Trust-deed of the School, a course to which I earnestly hope the Church will never consent.

On the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

THE interest now generally felt in the subject of Ritual is traceable, for the most part, to the restoration in many quarters of those usages in respect of Vestment and Ceremonial which the Universal Church, from a very early period, had employed in connexion with her great act of worship, the Holy Eucharist, and which, though generally disused among ourselves, had, happily, never been authoritatively discarded.

Ritual is valuable only as the expression of doctrine, and as a most important means of teaching it, especially to the uneducated and the poor. It may be well, therefore, at this time, to re-state that great doctrine which is the true groundwork of the whole theory and practice of Church worship—the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The partial obscuration of this doctrine in our reformed Service Book (by way of reaction from certain popular superstitious perversions of it current in the later Mediæval period), has doubtless been the principal cause of the inadequate notions on the subject of Church worship which have been, until comparatively lately, current amongst us.

Until it is understood that Christian worship is really the earthly exhibition of CHRIST'S perpetual intercession as the sole High Priest of His Church, the sole acceptable Presenter of the one worship of His one Body in Heaven and in earth, and that as such it culminates in His own mysterious Presence, in and by the Sacrament of His most precious Body and Blood, a stately and significant Ritual will of course be simply unintelligible, and, therefore, to English minds, intolerable. The Ritual will never be accepted, except in so far as the doctrine it expresses is understood and embraced; and it is very far from desirable that it should be.

Most Christian men, probably, in this country, when they set themselves to meditate on the Ordinance of the LORD'S Supper, dwell chiefly on its aspect as a Communion, or Communication to those who actually receive it, of the Body and Blood of CHRIST. If we are preparing ourselves to take part in this most solemn act of Christian worship, our thoughts in most cases are directed chiefly to the fact that we are ourselves to be made partakers of those most precious Gifts.

It is natural that our thoughts should run much in this direction, because, as we are taught in the Catechism that "the inward part, or thing signified" by the outward bread and wine, is "the Body and Blood of CHRIST, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the LORD'S Supper," so are we taught that "the benefits whereof we are made partakers thereby" are "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of CHRIST, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." It is natural, because the more usual name among us for this holy Ordinance—viz., "the LORD'S Supper," and the name given in the Prayer Book itself to that whereon the sacred elements are placed, viz., "the LORD'S Table," are both, to the minds of most persons, exclusively suggestive of the spiritual feeding, or Communion. It is natural, also, because the actual participation of the Sacrament has, since the Reformation, been brought forward into its due prominence, and properly insisted on amongst us, as of necessity for all the faithful, necessary also for the due performance of the rite itself; and such a thing as Communion without Communicants has now, for more than three hundred years, been happily unknown amongst us.

The Holy Eucharist is, however, so transcendent a mystery, that no one view of it, dwelt on exclusively, is sufficient to exhaust its fulness of grace and blessing. It is the highest, the most solemn, the fullest and most perfect act of Christian worship. It is the noblest offering of praise, the grandest and most joyous act of thanksgiving, the completest and most efficacious form of prayer, the surest means of obtaining the grace and favour of our Heavenly Father, the most acceptable act of homage that we can offer to Him, the one act of worship specially and expressly enjoined on all generations of Christians by our LORD Himself until His coming again. But we shall miss of seeing all this, and shall form a very insufficient notion, if we dwell only on that aspect of this great Ordinance which directly concerns ourselves, and the benefit of our own souls, forgetting that which more nearly concerns the honour and glory of Almighty GOD.

And we may be reminded, that the Holy Sacrament may be, and ought to be, regarded in other points of view besides that of its being a Feast and a Communion, by the other names and terms which are in common use in connexion with it. These being both Scriptural and Catholic, are not to be ignored merely because certain popular abuses which had arisen in the later centuries of the Mediæval period, and the necessity, at almost any cost, of eradicating those abuses, seemed, in the judgment

of the Church in the sixteenth century, to justify the temporary retrenchment or suppression of some at least among them. We often call it, for instance, by the name of "Eucharist," showing that in it we render honour and thanks to Almighty GOD for His mercies bestowed upon us, as well as receive further mercies. In the Prayer Book itself it is called "a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;" and again in the same prayer, a "Sacrifice" which, notwithstanding our unworthiness, it is "our bounden duty and service" to offer. With this agrees the use of the sacrificial word "Oblations," with reference to the elements of bread and wine; and the use in common language of the word "Altar," as well as "LORD'S Table," two phrases which, in Scriptural language, are simply, it need not be said, synonymous, two names, that is, for the same thing, regarded now in this, now in that point of view[1].

So, too, the word "priest" belongs to the same set of ideas, and is connected with the same view of Christian worship. And that without trenching in the least, when rightly understood, on either of those two cognate truths, the sole and unique Priesthood of the one true Priest, JESUS CHRIST, or the common priesthood of all Christian people. Indeed the true doctrine of the official priesthood in the Catholic Church can only be rightly and fully understood when it is viewed in connexion with these correlative and balancing truths. True it is, indeed, most blessedly true, as will be shown hereafter, that there is but one only Priest and but one only Sacrifice for sins for ever. True also it is, most blessedly true, that He Who is our common Redeemer hath made us all to be "kings and priests unto GOD and His Father," "an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to GOD by JESUS CHRIST;" and that the anointing oil of the grace of the HOLY GHOST, wherewith the true Aaron was anointed without measure, floweth down "even unto the very skirts of his clothing," anointing His whole Body, reaching unto and blessing and consecrating even the humblest and lowliest of His members. This grace, imparted to all Christians in the first instance when they became His members in their Baptism, is vouchsafed in fuller measure by the laying on of hands in their Confirmation, which is, as it were, the common ordination of all Christian people to this their common priesthood, admitting

[1] Compare four very noticeable passages in Ezekiel, ch. xxxix. 17—20; xl. 38—43; xli. 22, 23; xliv. 15, 16, and two in the first chapter of Malachi; also S. Paul's argument in 1 Cor. x. 16—21, which absolutely requires a sacrificial sense for the expression "Lord's Table."

them to share in the offering up and in the partaking of the Christian Sacrifice, the LORD'S Supper. His part in this great act is the highest privilege of a Christian, just as, of the special functions of the ordained priest, which distinguish him alike from the deacon and the layman, the celebration of the Holy Communion is the highest.

The use, then, of these words—Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar—in connexion with the Holy Eucharist, points to another aspect of that holy ordinance, perhaps not so frequently dwelt upon amongst us, but none the less necessary to be borne in mind, that we may not fall below the standard of GOD'S whole truth in our estimation of this exceeding mystery, nor fail to realize to the full the glories of our birthright and inheritance as members of the Family of GOD, the Church of the Firstborn, and of our share in its acceptable priesthood.

Now the central and important word of the three is the word "sacrifice." On this the others depend. The "priest" is a priest, as S. Paul says, because he offers "gifts and sacrifices;" and the "altar" is an altar because "gifts and sacrifices" are offered upon it. ("A sacrifice—*θυσία*—implies an altar—*θυσιαστήριον*." Bishop Browne on Article XXXI.).

The word "sacrifice" means "the act of offering or presenting an oblation before Almighty GOD." This act does not necessarily imply in every case the offering of a living creature, which is sacrificed by the shedding of its blood. For instance, the offering presented by Melchizedek, the "Priest of the most High GOD," and the great type of our LORD'S priesthood in even a higher sense than Aaron and his sons, was not a bleeding victim, but "bread and wine," the very elements of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Under the Levitical law, there were sacrifices of fine flour and of bread, and of cakes of unleavened dough, mingled with oil, as well as of the living victims of sheep and oxen. For the essence of sacrifice as such, that which has made it, and, we can hardly doubt, by GOD'S original primæval appointment, to be the chiefest and most important act of worship in every religion, whether Patriarchal, Jewish, Gentile, or Christian, is not the material thing offered, but the inward disposition of devout, adoring homage, and perfect surrender and dedication of ourselves, and our whole will and being, to GOD, of which the outward sacrifice of the most precious of our material possessions is but the visible symbol and embodiment.

Sacrifice, then, in this, its essential meaning, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and adoration, is due to the Almighty Creator of all things from every one of His rational creatures—

from the highest seraph among all the angelic host, from the most blessed among all the spirits of just men made perfect, down to the lowest and humblest among the fallen sons of men.

This is the sacrifice offered by those who rest not day and night, saying, "Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD GOD Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come," as witnessed in vision by Isaiah and S. John. This is the homage of them who cast their crowns before the throne, saying, "Worthy art Thou, O LORD, to receive glory, and honour, and power, for thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created." This is also our sacrifice of praise and high thanksgiving when, "with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of Heaven, we laud and magnify GOD's glorious Name, evermore praising Him, and saying—Holy, Holy, Holy, LORD GOD of Hosts, Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory; glory be to Thee, O LORD most High."

And had sin never marred GOD's fair creation, had man never fallen and become estranged from his Creator, sacrifice and worship would have had none other end than thus to serve for a joyous expression of adoring love and praise; nor would those ideas of pain and suffering have entered in which we now commonly associate with the term "sacrifice." The surrender of self in perfect willing obedience to the Creator, is the delight and joy of perfect and unfallen beings. But man, fallen and depraved, with a will weak and reluctant towards good, cannot, in his unredeemed state, render the acceptable sacrifice and service of a willing obedience to his Heavenly Father. His tendency after the Fall is not to approach Him as a son, but to hide himself from His sight with the fearfulness of conscious guilt. His prerogative of being the acceptable priest of this lower and material creation, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to GOD, was then forfeited and lost. As fallen, he needed some priest who should act for him, and intercede with GOD on his behalf, to deprecate His wrath, and to offer some expiatory sacrifice for him who could offer none for himself. And such an High Priest was found for him in the promised seed of the woman, the Incarnate SON of GOD, Who one day should come to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. But sacrifice for sin (since the disobedience of sin involved the forfeiture of life) must involve suffering and bloodshed; for without shedding of blood, without offering life for life, there could be no remission, the sentence of death could never be reversed.

And so, in order to direct the faith of all generations of men

who should live before the SON of GOD came in the flesh, to that one perfect Sacrifice for sin which He alone could offer, GOD taught to Adam and his family the rite of offering the blood of a slain beast, to foreshadow that Blood of the new and perfect Covenant which one day should be poured forth on Calvary.

It was in this way, and for this reason that, besides those sacrifices and offerings which had for their object the expression of praise and thanksgiving, and the acknowledgment of GOD's dominion over all His creatures, there was introduced what we call, for the sake of distinction, the "expiatory" or "propitiatory" sacrifice, the offering, that is, of a living animal, by the shedding of the blood thereof, which is the life thereof, in token that the life of him who offered it, and whose substitute and representative it was, was forfeited to the law of GOD in consequence of his sin.

Henceforth, sacrifices involving the death of a living victim became the leading and essential feature of all the religions prevalent among mankind. And it would seem that the second great act of disobedience to Almighty GOD was Cain's disregard of this divine institution. Cain, who was a tiller of the ground, brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. This was right. Offerings of that kind were specially enacted under the Law, and our offering of the bread and wine, before they are consecrated, has, in one aspect of it, the same meaning, the presentation, viz., of that which is the staff of man's life, his principal bodily sustenance, to GOD, in acknowledgment that all the fruits of the earth are the gifts of His bounty, and really belong to Him, just as at the same time we also present our alms, in acknowledgment that it is "He Who giveth us power to get wealth," that all the increase of our substance is from Him, that "all things come of Him, and of His own do we give Him."

But this was not enough. Fallen man must also acknowledge his sinfulness before Him Whom he has offended, must offer the life of some animal, in token that his own life is forfeited, and as a profession of his faith in that one perfect expiatory sacrifice which GOD had promised. This Cain, as it appears, did not do, and consequently GOD had not respect unto his offering; but when Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock for sacrifice, to him and to his offering GOD had respect, showing probably by some visible token that He accepted the repentance and faith of Abel, the sprinkled blood of whose sacrifice became henceforth the type of that other precious "Blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

The principle of bloody sacrifices, thus primevally instituted, was developed and systematized in the numerous sacrifices of the Levitical Law, and became the most prominent feature of the Jewish religion and of the Temple worship. And the whole meaning and intention of these continual sacrifices, and of this elaborate system, was simply to point onwards to that great ONE Who was to come and to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; Who—Himself the Victim, and Himself the Priest—was to offer Himself, His own Body and His own Blood, for "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction," consummated finally and for ever upon the Altar of His Cross.

Of themselves the Jewish sacrifices had not, could not have, any virtue. It was "not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." In themselves they had no intrinsic merit, and could make no expiation; only when offered in faith in the promised Messiah they were accepted by GOD for His sake that was to come, and Who, in the everlasting purpose of GOD, was already "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." And as they were but types and shadows, so they were all fulfilled and done away in CHRIST. He, the true Aaron, and, greater still, the true Melchizedek, having during His three years' ministry fulfilled His office of Teacher and Prophet, began His solemn action as our Priest when He took the bread, and brake it, and said, "This is My Body which is now being given for you"—*i.e.*, sacrificed on your behalf; "This is My Blood which is now being poured out for you and for many for the remission of sins," *i.e.*, as a true, and real, and efficacious sacrifice of expiation.

In order to understand the real significance of our LORD'S action as Priest on our behalf, we must remember that all that He did at that last great Passover at which it was ordained that all should be fulfilled; all that He did from the moment when He said, "This is My Body," to the moment when He said, "It is finished," was one long continuous sacrificial action. The sacrifice was made in purpose and intention, it was made so far as CHRIST'S will went (and the surrender of the will in perfect obedience to GOD'S will is, we have seen, the inner essence of all sacrifice), when CHRIST took the bread and brake it, expressing thereby the breaking and offering up of His Body, and poured out the wine, expressing thereby the outpouring of His Blood, both then and there done virtually and implicitly as afterwards outwardly and visibly, with all the circumstances of suffering, upon the Altar of the Cross.

The declaration of Himself as the Lamb of GOD, the very

Paschal Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world, as the one acceptable sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction—then and there offered by Himself as Priest, when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood—the great intercessory prayer, the agony of His mental sufferings in the garden, the agony of suffering, both mental and bodily, upon the Cross—all this was one great whole, one solemn sacrificial action, nay, the only true, real, and effectual Sacrifice that ever was, or ever can be offered.

If this leading truth be duly remembered, there can be no risk of our confounding the Eucharistic Sacrifice with the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it is the "perpetual memory," or of thinking that when the Catholic Church speaks, as she always has spoken, of the Holy Communion as a Sacrifice, she in any way derogates from the sole and unapproachable grandeur of that only "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" which was consummated on Calvary, when the rending of the veil signified that the one acceptable Offering had at length been made, and that the way into the Holiest of all was now for ever open.

But although that great Sacrifice, with all its attendant circumstances of suffering and bloodshed, was and could be made and done only once, yet its efficacy and its virtue abide for evermore. Death and suffering are over, for JESUS is risen and glorified. Death hath no more dominion over Him, "for in that He died He died unto sin once, but in that He liveth He liveth unto GOD." This is He "that liveth and was dead, and behold He is alive for evermore." But "He ever liveth to make intercession for us," in the very innermost sanctuary of the Heavenly Temple, in the true Holy of Holies, the very presence itself of GOD. Enthroned in majesty at GOD'S right hand, He sits a King. Glory and great worship are laid upon Him. All power is given unto Him in Heaven and earth. And yet, though now exalted to be our *King*, He still continues to be our *Priest*. He is "a Priest for ever;" possessing a Priesthood which does not, like Aaron's, pass on from one to another by reason of death, but is unchangeably vested in Him alone, because He liveth ever, and needs no successor, but "abideth a Priest continually."

But "every priest," S. Paul says, "must have somewhat to offer." And what does CHRIST now offer, as our ever-living Priest in the Heavenly Temple? What but His own most precious Body and Blood, the one saving Victim to make reconciliation for our sins, and unite Heaven and earth in one?

As the Levitical high priest once each year on the great Day

of Atonement, after he had made and done the sacrifice, and the blood-shedding was over, entered into the most holy place within the veil, and there offered and presented the blood of the slain victim before the LORD (Levit. xvi.), exactly so did JESUS, the Mediator of the New Covenant, enter by His Ascension into the Heavenly Holy of holies, there for ever to plead and present before Almighty GOD that precious and acceptable Body and Blood which once in death and suffering He had offered upon the Altar of the Cross. He made the Sacrifice once for all, and declared it "finished," neither by Himself nor by any other to be reiterated or repeated; and "there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone." But though He repeats not the Sacrifice, nor again can offer Himself as a Victim unto death, yet in His perpetual intercession for us He perpetually, as it were, appealeth to it. His perpetual intercession is founded upon it, upon a continual presenting and pleading of it before GOD on our behalf. The continual offering of a sacrifice, made once for all, does not necessarily imply any repetition, at intervals, of the same acts and circumstances whereby and wherewith it was made in the first instance. A victim once actually sacrificed by death and accepted, may, if endued with new and never-ending life, be continually offered—*i.e.*, presented, pleaded, brought into remembrance, before GOD. And this continual offering and presentation of a sacrifice once made, is itself a sacrificial act, and constitutes him who does it a priest, according to S. Paul's definition, "one ordained for men in things pertaining to GOD, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." (Heb. v. 1.) The act of offering or presenting a victim is a sacrifice, though that victim be not, as of old, a new one slain on each occasion, nor yet the same slain anew on each occasion. It is a true Sacrifice, though the Victim be always the same, not slain anew, but offered as before slain once for all, and "after the power of an endless life" possessing an abiding virtue for evermore. It is a Propitiatory Sacrifice, as pleading before GOD for all the successive generations, for all the several individuals, of the human race, the one only Expiation once made.

Ask the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews his view of the functions of the great High Priest; read in the Apocalypse of the Heavenly Temple and its glorious ritual; inquire of the beloved disciple what he saw through the door that was opened in Heaven; and they will tell of "the true tabernacle which the LORD pitched and not man," of the pre-existent "heavenly things," the divinely-ordained patterns of which the Levitical tabernacle and its furniture and usages were but the copy and

shadow and figure, of the "greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands," of the abiding celestial original, of the Heavenly Temple and its Altar, and in its midst the One everlasting Priest, the One everlasting Victim, JESUS, the "Lamb as it had been slain," continually presenting Himself before GOD as the One Propitiation that—not *took*—but "*taketh* away the sins of the world," as the One Advocate with the FATHER Who—not *was*—but "*is* the Propitiation for our sins." (Compare the Bishop of Exeter's *Pastoral Letter* of 1851, p. 54.)

And to this heavenly worship we are admitted. The Church on earth is but the outer court of Heaven. Her services are no longer, as they were under the preparatory covenant, mere "copies" (*ὑποδείγματα*, Heb. viii. 5, ix. 23), "shadows," "figures" or "parables" (*παραβολὴ*, Heb. ix. 9), of the worship of Heaven. They are gloriously real. They are one with, essentially identical with, the worship of Heaven. For as the Church in Heaven and in earth is one, so its worship in Heaven and in earth is one; one in its inner essence of deep spiritual reality, though necessarily manifested differently under the different conditions of earth and Heaven. The charter of this our worship, the assurance of its reality, the foundation of its oneness with that of Heaven, is contained in those blessed words of CHRIST, "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name there am I in the midst of them." Present in Heaven openly, corporally, and naturally; present on earth mystically, spiritually, supernaturally, but altogether and absolutely really, He is in the midst of us, not merely as GOD, by that mode of presence whereby GOD is every where, but also as our High Priest and Mediator, "the Man CHRIST JESUS," Whose presentation of our worship, so continually appealed to even in our non-Eucharistic services in the oft-recurring words, "through JESUS CHRIST our LORD," gives its sole acceptableness before the FATHER;—in the midst of us in all our worship, but specially, and in most intense reality, in the Christian Sacrifice, there, as ever, Himself the offered Victim, and Himself the eternal Priest.

Thus what the Christian priest does at the altar is, as it were, the earthly form and visible expression of our LORD's continual action as our High Priest in Heaven.

As the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, the alone acceptable Victim to make our peace with GOD, are offered, that is, continually presented and pleaded, by JESUS Himself in Heaven, naturally, as we may say, and openly, so the same most holy Body and Blood are continually presented and pleaded before GOD by CHRIST's representatives, acting "in His Name," and

"by His commission and authority," (Article XXVI.) on earth. Here, however, this solemn action is necessarily performed supernaturally, in a mystery, under the veils of Bread and Wine, after no carnal manner, in no low material sense, but after a manner altogether heavenly and spiritual, and appreciable only by faith. It is performed, that is to say, in the same sense and after the same manner, as He Himself performed it in the Upper Chamber, when He gave to His Apostles and their successors the command, "Do this in remembrance of Me." And this high mystery is wrought by the power of the HOLY GHOST, the great invisible Agent in all the ministrations of grace under the New Covenant.

The earthly priest, then, no longer as of old the successor of a long line of dead predecessors in a merely typical priesthood, but the present vicarious representative of the one true, real, and ever-living Priest, now for a time corporally absent, acting "in His Name," by the power of the HOLY GHOST, specially conveyed to him in the gift of Holy Orders "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of GOD," does on earth that which JESUS does in Heaven. Rather we should say, according to that great principle which is the true key to the whole theory of the Christian ministry, it is JESUS Who is Himself the Priest, the offerer of His own great Sacrifice, in both cases[2]. It is the one Mediator, acting in Heaven directly, as we may say, and immediately by Himself, acting on earth indirectly and mediately by His minister as His visible instrument, who, forasmuch as in that most solemn of all his duties he represents the priestly functions of his heavenly Master, is himself, for that reason, and for that reason only, called a "priest," whilst that on which this mysterious transaction takes place, that on which lie, veiled under the visible symbols, that Body and Blood which once for us were sacrificed upon the Cross, is called an "altar." In the strictest and most literal sense, "expiatory sacrifice" there never was any but that which was begun in the Upper Chamber and finished upon the Cross; "priest" there never was nor could be any but JESUS

[2] Compare S. John iv. 1—"Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus Himself baptized not, but his disciples." S. Matt. x. 40—"He that receiveth you receiveth Me." S. Luke x. 16—"He that heareth you heareth Me;" *i.e.*, speaking in you by the Holy Spirit; for —S. Matt. x. 20—"It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." And S. Paul says of absolution—"For your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ," 2 Cor. ii. 10. Compare 1 Cor. v. 4. See also the passages from S. Cyril, S. Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, &c., in chap. xi. of Wilberforce *On the Holy Eucharist.*

CHRIST; nor "altar," save only the Holy Cross. Still, because they have an important connexion with, and relation to, those grand and unique realities which can be expressed in no other way, the Christian Eucharist, being the solemn memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the present exhibition of CHRIST's priestly intercession in Heaven, is called a "sacrifice," its celebrant is called a "priest," and that whereon it is celebrated is called an "altar." We Christians, as S. Paul says, "have an altar, whereof they had no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle," *i.e.*, who, not believing in CHRIST, still clung to the worship of the Jewish Temple—an altar more truly so than ever was any in the carnal Jerusalem, though dedicated with the slaughtered hecatombs of a Solomon. "And, indeed," as Bishop Cosin has well said, "the Sacrament of the Eucharist carries the name of a Sacrifice, and the table whereon it is celebrated an Altar of oblation, in a far higher sense than any of their former services did, which were but the types and figures of those services that are performed in recognition and memory of CHRIST's own sacrifice once offered upon the Altar of His Cross." (*Notes on the Prayer Book.* Second Series. Works, vol. v., p. 348.)

We see, then, that the Ordinance of the Holy Communion, besides its aspect of blessing to ourselves as a means of feeding us with the spiritual Food of the most precious Body and Blood of CHRIST, has also another most important aspect as a solemn, the most solemn, act of worship towards Almighty GOD, the pleading before GOD for man of the one acceptable propitiation, in union with the perpetual presentation of Himself in Heaven by the Man CHRIST JESUS, as our sole acceptable Priest, the one Head of the redeemed family of GOD.

In order rightly to understand this, we must keep in mind the following fundamental Christian axioms. By the Incarnation, and Passion, and Resurrection of CHRIST, GOD and Man are reconciled in Him. Heaven is reopened, and faith may now see "the Angels of GOD ascending and descending upon" that true Jacob's Ladder, "the SON of MAN," Emmanuel, GOD with us. Now, through Him, we have access with confidence. We have boldness to enter even into the Holiest by the Blood of JESUS, through His Flesh. Heaven and earth are made one, so that there is now but one family of GOD in Heaven and in earth. To this family, by GOD's unspeakable mercy, we belong. Already is it said of us that "He hath made us sit together in heavenly places in CHRIST." Already is it said of us that "we *are* come" not to any mere earthly sanctuary that might be touched, but "unto Mount Sion, and unto the City of the Living GOD, the Heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of Angels, to the

general Assembly and Church of the Firstborn, which are written in Heaven, and to GOD the Judge of all, and to the Spirits of just men made perfect, and to JESUS the Mediator of the new Covenant, and to the Blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

The Holy Catholic Church then, the Communion of Saints, though made up of two portions, one triumphant in Heaven, one militant here on earth, is to the eye of faith really one. All the terms used to denote it in Holy Scripture imply this great fundamental truth. It is one "Body," of which CHRIST is the Head; one "Vine," of which CHRIST is the Root; one "Fold," of which CHRIST is the Shepherd; one "Family," of which GOD is the Father, and CHRIST the Firstborn SON, the chiefest among His many brethren; one "Holy City," of which CHRIST is the Corner-stone, and Apostles the Twelve Foundations; one "Temple," in which CHRIST, by his perpetual intercession, is the one Priest and the one Victim, the one acceptable Presenter of its one continual worship. This is the great principle to be borne in mind if we are to rise to any adequate conception of what is really meant by the Church's Eucharistic worship. And this essential oneness of the Church in Heaven and earth is further both ratified and, as it were, exhibited in act, by CHRIST'S perpetual presence with His Church on earth, according to His promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." His bodily removal was but, as He taught the Apostles in His last discourses with them, to be introductory to a higher, a fuller, and a nearer mode of presence, whereby, through the HOLY GHOST shed forth at Pentecost, He would "come to them," and be to them a heart-joy that "no man could take from them"—(S. John xvi. 22). A little while, and though the world saw Him no more, yet they, and all believers, should see Him, not in spite of His going, but "because He was to go, to the FATHER." For His Ascension was to be the necessary preliminary to that effusion of the HOLY SPIRIT wherein and whereby He returned in power and in love to quicken and to bless His orphaned Church. Thenceforward and for ever He is her Emmanuel; with her in her individual members, dwelling in their hearts by faith (Eph. iii. 17); with her in her common worship; with her in her constant witness for Him and for His Truth; with her in the official action of her priests and bishops, His ordained representatives; with her in the full power and majesty of His Incarnate Deity in the Sacrament of His own institution, according to His own most sure word—"This is My Body; This is My Blood."

So long as Christians practically look back with a mere historical faith across the gulf of eighteen centuries to the past fact

that an Atonement was made on Calvary by a SAVIOUR Who, having "finished" His work, returned to Heaven, and was hid in the inaccessible glory whence He came; so long as they fail to realize how "*much more*" we "who were reconciled to GOD by the death of His Son," now "being reconciled, shall be saved *by His life*," (Rom. v. 10), and that His Mediatorial life, wherein and whereby He carries on His application of His "finished work" to individual souls throughout the successive generations of mankind, has, through His HOLY SPIRIT, a real and efficacious manifestation in His Church on earth as well as in Heaven; so long as, on grounds essentially rationalistic at bottom, they doubt or disbelieve the reality of Sacramental grace, or of CHRIST'S especial presence in the Holy Eucharist; so long will they take a wholly inadequate view of Christianity, and fail utterly to realize either its glory, its grandeur, its efficacy, and its power, or the unspeakable nearness and blessedness of our relation to Him Who is its glorious centre; so long will they fail to appreciate the majestic dignity of our Christian worship, and will misunderstand and denounce that reverent care about its minutest accessories, which to the full believer is but the natural and spontaneous expression of his faith and love, the unstudied outflow of an affection which truly believes in and thoroughly realizes, in His unspeakable tenderness and nearness, Him for Whose sake solely it is done, and without Whom it were worse than worthless.

On no subject unhappily has more misunderstanding, the fruit partly of ignorance and prejudice, partly of defective belief, been current than on the one under consideration, the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The gross, carnal, and almost Capernaite views which, seemingly countenanced by the Transubstantiation theory of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, prevailed in the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation; the material view, which naturally followed, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, its perversion in popular current practice into "the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" of "Sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer CHRIST" (*i.e.*, by way of re-enacting the Sacrifice of Calvary by an actual mactation afresh) "for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt";—all this, in the great ferment of the Reformation, led not unnaturally to an extreme reaction in the opposite direction as regards this whole class of subjects. Here, as elsewhere, in denouncing the error, men denounced the truth of which it was the caricature. In rooting up the tares, they went near to rooting up the wheat with them. And even our Reformers, against

their own better judgment, suffered themselves to be induced by foreign influence to surrender that distinct and emphatic enunciation of the truths which, as the best safeguard against error, they had given us in the Liturgy of 1549, the genuine offspring of their own unbiassed judgment, and to veil it in the mutilated and dislocated Liturgy of 1552.

If we have read aright the signs of the times during the last twenty years, we may believe that GOD is mercifully, in this matter also as in others, leading back His Church in this country to a fuller appreciation of that Catholic Truth, her inheritance whereof she, of His great mercy, has never forfeited.

The Eucharistic controversies have, like the Baptismal, been wonderfully overruled to the exhibition and propagation and more general acceptance of the truth. And we may not doubt that through the threatened agitation on the closely kindred subject of Ritual, the Divine Hand which has guided the Church aright heretofore will guide her aright again, and bring good out of evil. The thing most earnestly to be desired, humanly speaking, is an equitable and tolerant patience and breadth of view, and an adequate theological learning, in our spiritual rulers, qualities not always found even where we have most right to expect them.

There is a painful *ignoratio elenchi* running through a whole section on the "Revival of Ritualism" in the recent charge of one among the few members of the Episcopal Bench who enjoy any reputation for theological acquirement. It seems to the Bishop of Ely that the use of "Processions, copes, altar-lights, and incense," involves the doctrine of "the propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass;" *i.e.*, as he proceeds afterwards to define, of "the renewal or iteration of the Sacrifice of CHRIST," of a "propitiatory offering Him up anew for sin," as a "proper sacrifice," *i.e.*, "a sacrifice with shedding of blood, offered as propitiation for sin." This doctrine, the Bishop very truly says, has "hitherto found no place in our theology." On the contrary, it is most probably that very current abuse of the Catholic doctrine which the Reformers justly branded as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." He might as truly have said that such a doctrine has happily never found a place in the authorized formal theology of any Christian Communion. The Canons and Creed of the Council of Trent most certainly do not affirm it; unless Christians are to be arbitrarily bound to use the word *sacrificium* only in what the Bishop of Ely calls "the ancient Jewish sense," which he himself, in his commentary on the Thirty-first Article, shows they are not; or, forbidden to take the word *propitiatorium* in the same sense in which, as he also in

the same section informs us, the phrase "sacrifice of propitiation" was used by S. Cyril of Jerusalem. Among our own theologians, Bishop Cosin (adopting very much the language of Calixtus' dissertation *De Sacrificio Christi semel in Cruce oblato et initerabili*) writes as follows on this subject:—"Nor do we say it is so nude a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; but that by our prayers also added, we offer and present the death of CHRIST to GOD, that for His death's sake we may find mercy, in which respect we deny not this commemorative sacrifice to be propitiatory." (*Notes on the Prayer Book.* Second Series. Works, vol. v., p. 336.)

It may also be affirmed with confidence, that the monstrous notion of any "renewal or iteration of the Sacrifice" of Calvary is not, and probably never was, held by any educated theologian in Christendom. We may say of it to Continental theologians, whether Eastern or Latin, as Archbishop Bramhall said to M. de Milletière of the notion of a "suppletory sacrifice, to supply the defects of the only true Sacrifice of the Cross," that "we hope both you and we abhor" it[3]. To say that it was "to suit this view of the Eucharist" that "the Holy Table was made as like as possible to the stone Altar on which beasts were slain; incense was offered with the sacrifice to imitate the Temple worship; the presbyter was vested like a sacrificing priest, and the procession was as when the victim was led up to be slain," is a misreading of history, and would imply (see the context) to an uninformed reader that these usages were peculiar to the Roman Communion, and grew up only in "process of time," instead of being, as in fact they are, co-extensive with the whole of ancient Christendom, from Malabar to Cadiz, and that from a very early period.

Certainly it is not to suit any such view, which no man at any rate within our own Church holds, that the restoration of lights, vestments, and incense, (things which, on the Bishop of Ely's theory, the Church when she reformed herself ought solemnly and expressly to have forbidden,) is desired by those amongst us by whom it is desired. The doctrines involved in the pious endeavour to pay the full honour which the Church, when her own voice (distinct enough as regards the lights and the vestments at least) can be heard above the confused noise of the various claimants to represent her, expressly commands to be

[3] See the language of the Jesuit Maldonatus in his *Disp. circa* vii. *Sacramenta*, tom. i. p. 322, et seq. Lyons edition of 1614—referred to by Bishop Cosin in *Notes on the Prayer Book*, First Series: and the *Commentaries* of the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide, and the Minorite Friar Bernardinus à Piconio, on Heb. vii. 27.

paid to the one great ordinance of worship which is of CHRIST's own institution, are at bottom :—

1. That of the Real Presence—the doctrine that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are "verily and indeed taken and received," are, "after an heavenly and spiritual manner, given, taken, and eaten," in the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper, and that where His Body and Blood are there is He—there, as wherever else He is, with profoundest homage to be adored; and,

2. As founded upon this, the doctrine of the solemn pleading before the Eternal FATHER of that once sacrificed Body and Blood for ourselves, and for "all His whole Church," as our only hope of pardon, reconciliation, and grace.

On these two kindred subjects scarcely any thing need be added, for the modern reader, to the Bishop of Brechin's *Theological Defence* of his celebrated Charge (pp. 10—80, and 104—120), and to Mr. Keble's golden tractate on *Eucharistical Adoration* (chap. ii. § 36, &c.). It needs only to be clearly understood that the action of the Eucharist is not the counterpart of the Sacrifice of the Cross, much less in any sense the repetition of it. (See Mr. Keble's emphatic repudiation of this notion, chap. ii. § 46, p. 74.) It is the "memorial" of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that "perpetual memory" before GOD and man (See Bishop Browne on Article XXXI.) "which CHRIST Himself did institute, and commanded us to continue." It is the *counterpart* of our LORD's perpetual intercession in Heaven, the visible exhibition, the "very image" (Heb. x. 1) of that intercession under the earthly conditions of place and time. The depth of its blessing rests on the fact of His own mysterious presence with us, as Himself, in the true inner reality which faith discerns, both Priest and Offering, as well as the Dispenser to His faithful ones of Himself as the Bread of Life, the true Heavenly Food and Sustenance both of their bodies and their souls. [On this subject a passage from Cassander, adopted by Cosin in his First Series of *Notes on the Prayer Book*, may here be quoted:—"Therefore 'this is no new Sacrifice, but the same which was once offered, and which is every day offered to GOD by CHRIST in Heaven, and continueth here still on earth by a mystical representation of it in the Eucharist. And the Church intends not to have any new propitiation, or new remission of sins obtained, but to make that effectual, and in act applied unto us, which was once obtained by the Sacrifice of CHRIST upon the Cross. Neither is the Sacrifice of the Cross, as it was once offered up there, *modo cruento*, so much remembered in the Eucharist, though it be commemorated, as regard is had to the perpetual and daily offering of it by CHRIST now in Heaven

in his everlasting priesthood, and thereupon was and should be still the *juge sacrificium* observed here on earth, as it is in Heaven:' the reason which the ancient fathers had for their daily sacrifice."]

This is a great mystery, but we speak concerning CHRIST to His Church. We speak of truths profoundly spiritual, and needing to be spiritually discerned, though liable, alas! like other high spiritual truths, to be unbelievingly rejected by unspiritual minds, or, if unspiritually embraced, to be perverted. Above all, we speak of Him Who is GOD made Man, of One Whose acts must not be measured by our feeble sense, but must be interpreted by the more sure word of His own true promise, as embraced, in all simplicity of devout affection, by personal faith in His own Divine Self.

These two doctrines, of CHRIST'S sole High-Priesthood, energetically and efficaciously exhibited by the power of the HOLY GHOST, in the divine and supernatural system of the visible kingdom of GOD, and of His own Real Presence in His own august Sacrament, as at once our Offering and our Food, are no mere unimportant speculative theories; they are, and are by thousands amongst us felt to be, most deeply and essentially practical, nay, absolutely vital. Nowhere more closely than through them does sound Christian theology, deep, broad, and high, touch the inner personal life of the devout believer. For it is on the divine facts of which they are the expression that he feels himself dependent for his continually needful cleansing, and for that spiritual support and sustenance which are necessary to his very existence as a regenerate soul, living the new life by a living union and communion with his risen SAVIOUR. Little do some of our Fathers in GOD seem to reck of the anguish, not unmixed with indignation, caused to faithful souls by the shallow denials of unpopular truths into which they sometimes allow themselves to be drawn. Would that controversial writers would more frequently remember, that in the matter of religious and spiritual truth, men are generally right in what they affirm, and wrong in what they deny. It is given perhaps to no man to see the Truth all round. Let those who humbly seek it, enunciate humbly that which GOD has given them to see. And let others refrain from hasty and angry denunciation of truth, which, though not as yet revealed or brought home to them, is yet neither contradictory to the first principles, nor inconsistent with the analogy, of the Faith. Still more is this a duty in the case of a truth which, however unfamiliar or however unpopular, is yet not obscurely taught in Holy Scripture, and flows naturally

from much of its most generally admitted teaching, and which, rightly understood, has been in the mind of the Church from the beginning, clearly embodied in the authoritative teaching of her most ancient Liturgies, and in the works of her greatest writers.

Periodical religious literature, especially when in the hands of a sectarian or partisan school, has, together with some good results, perhaps done much serious evil to theology in this generation. There is too little amongst us of deep and full self-acquired knowledge, too little of genuine original and independent thought. Amid the fashionable and almost inevitable "busy-ness" of the day, and the exaggerated estimation of the "practical" qualities, men are tempted to borrow both their knowledge and their thought second-hand.

Looking at the whirling current of human affairs, both ecclesiastical and civil, in this great age of little men, charged full with change of mightiest import for the future, it is impossible not to be struck with the narrowness of tone and the petty exclusiveness of thought with which great questions and controversies of momentous issue are too often dealt with. Examples of this may be seen in very much of the language that has been held on that cardinally important subject, the future Reunion of Christendom; or what to us is scarcely less so, the needful freedom from State interference, and the consolidation into an organized unity of the several Churches that make up the great Anglo-Catholic Communion. On such subjects as these, and generally on the current subjects of dispute within the Church itself, or between the Church and the World, one cannot help sometimes desiderating on the part of those in high places, a little more largeness and simplicity, a little more outspoken honesty and truthfulness, a little more fearless courage and independence, a little more disregard of public opinion, and of newspapers, and of consequences; in short, a little more of the heart of him who said, "With me it is a very small thing to be judged of you, or of man's judgment . . . He that judgeth me is the LORD."

Perhaps some minds may be inclined to give a more patient consideration to that portion of Catholic truth which is the subject of this Essay, when they are reminded that a more vigorous and emphatic expression of it can scarcely be found than occurs in two of Charles Wesley's hymns:—

O Thou eternal Victim, slain
A Sacrifice for guilty man,
By the Eternal SPIRIT made
An Offering in the sinner's stead,

Our everlasting Priest art Thou,
And plead'st Thy death for sinners now.

Thy Offering still continues new;
Thy vesture keeps its bloody hue;
Thou stand'st the ever-slaughtered Lamb;
Thy Priesthood still remains the same;
Thy years, O GOD, shall never fail,
Thy goodness is unchangeable.

O that our faith may never move,
But stand unshaken as Thy love!
Sure evidence of things unseen,
Now let it pass the years between,
And view Thee bleeding on the tree,
My GOD, Who dies for me, for me. [No. 545.]

And again:—

Victim Divine, Thy grace we claim,
While thus Thy precious death we show:
Once offered up, a spotless Lamb,
In Thy great Temple here below
Thou didst for all mankind atone,
And standest now before the Throne.

Thou standest in the Holy Place,
As now for guilty sinners slain;
The Blood of sprinkling speaks and prays,
All prevalent for helpless man;
Thy Blood is still our ransom found,
And speaks salvation all around.

The smoke of Thy Atonement here
Darkened the sun, and rent the veil,
Made the new way to Heaven appear,
And showed the great invisible;
Well-pleased in Thee, our GOD looked down,
And calls His rebels to a crown.

He still respects Thy Sacrifice;
Its savour sweet does always please;
The offering smokes through earth and skies,
Diffusing life, and joy, and peace;
To these Thy lower courts it comes,
And fills them with divine perfumes.

We need not now go up to Heaven,
To bring the long-sought SAVIOUR down;
Thou art to all already given,
And dost e'en now Thy banquet crown;
To every faithful soul appear,
And show Thy Real Presence here! [No. 551.]

Passages like these may surprise some who do not remember that the Methodist movement was initiated within the Church, and with a careful deference to ecclesiastical order, by men who, had they lived in these days, would unquestionably have been branded with all the opprobrious epithets now usually flung at "High Churchmen," and whose holy and self-denying efforts, in an age of rebuke and blasphemy, were forced into an undesired attitude of antagonism, by the cold apathetic indifference of men who, like some of their successors of the present day, could only try to trample out a religious energy which they had neither the grace to appreciate, nor the wisdom to control.

The Church of our day is stirred in like manner by a strong religious movement, traceable very probably in direct sequence to those of the Wesleyan and Evangelical schools of the last century. And there is a like danger lest the feeble policy of a mere cold, unsympathetic repression should, as before, result in a schism which would cast out of the National Church its most active and energetic workers. Those would-be iron rulers, whose lightest word would now be obeyed with alacrity, did they know how to show themselves true "Fathers in GOD," would then have time to reflect in the dull peace of the solitude they had made, and might haply come at last to the conviction that, after all, they had "fought against GOD," and with the usual result—their own confusion.

For a really living religious movement within the Church, if it is to be controlled, must be, to some extent at least, sympathized with and headed by the natural leaders of the Church. And woe to them, and to the Church herself, if their sole or their chief motive for withholding such sympathy is the fear of the opinion of the outer world. The Church is a living and growing body, not a dumb inanimate machine, whose movements can be externally controlled and moderated with absolute precision. Her animating principle is the SPIRIT of GOD; and where the SPIRIT of GOD is, there is liberty, and, with perfect unity of purpose, an almost infinite "diversity of operation." A cut-and-dried absence of all enthusiasm; a propriety which was not sober but frigid; an almost dead level of uniformity in externals,

and that a uniformity *not of obedience* to the Church's law, which would have been blessed, *but of careless neglect*, which was intolerable; an in-elasticity, which apparently rendered her system incapable alike of expansion and adaptation to present needs as respected either her services or her ritual, her practical agencies of benevolence, her missions, or her representative and constitutional arrangements—such seemed, until up to a comparatively recent date, the fixed characteristics of the Church of England since the Hanoverian period. She had suffered grievously from political complications, she had suffered grievously from the Nonjuring secession, she had shared in the general deadness of the Georgian era. The religious revival within her, with which the name of Wesley is connected, was, by a lamentable error, disowned and rejected, and the later Evangelical movement, most needful and in many respects most precious, was yet dwarfed by its adhesion to a narrow and inadequate theology, its uncatholic and partisan tone, and its unhappy repudiation, on grounds at bottom really rationalistic, of the truth of CHRIST'S living Sacramental agency through the HOLY SPIRIT within His Body, the Church.

Yet, notwithstanding these drawbacks, and amid countless mistakes and difficulties apparently overwhelming, GOD has led —GOD is leading—on His Church to a fuller appreciation in all its depth and breadth and height of that Catholic Faith which she has ever faithfully kept, filling her with a fuller, warmer, and more vigorous life, manifested continually in fresh agencies for the more efficient performance of her mission of mercy to the bodies and souls of men, giving her nobler conceptions of the greatness of her destiny in the religious history of the future, re-awakening within her that surest sign of life, an unfeigned love of the brethren, and a yearning towards the separated Communions that touch her on either side. No one who knows her can doubt this, least of all those who know her as only her own children can. And no one who duly weighs these tokens of GOD'S favour towards her, can fail to be convinced that she has, in His good Providence, a glorious career before her. Of those who feel this, the foremost duty is a warm inviolable loyalty to herself and her essential principles; and the next, heartily and candidly to recognize this loyalty, wherever and under whatever variety of manifestation it exists, as the true bond of brotherhood among her members. Instead of magnifying little differences of taste in devotional expression and ritual, instead of judging other men's liberty by our own conscience, and refusing to others what we eagerly claim for ourselves, let us

admit the fact that a Church which is to be national, much more a Communion which is fast becoming world-wide, must needs allow a very large liberty in all such matters, to suit every variety of character, education, and temperament; and let us remember that there is no greater hindrance to unity than the undue exercise of repressive authority in the vain endeavour to secure an outward uniformity, which is as undesirable as it is impracticable.

P. GOLDSMITH MEDD.

Since writing the above Essay, I have read the published correspondence on the subject of "The Altar, and Lights on the Altar," between the Bishop of Ely and the Rev. John W. H. Molyneux, and Archdeacon Freeman's recent pamphlet on *Rites and Ritual*.

On these subjects I rejoice to be able, with the kind permission of the writer, to avail myself of the subjoined letters, which have lately appeared in some of the Church newspapers.

The Bishop seems to endorse a distinction, untenable alike on Scriptural and on theological grounds, between the "LORD'S Table" and the "Altar." On this Mr. Bright remarks:—

"The Bishop (who admits the term 'Altar' in a certain sense) founds his objection to the legality of Altar Lights on an inference by a certain 'Dr. ——,' from a certain portion of the Privy Council 'Judgment' in Mr. Liddell's case (1857).

"On this I observe:—

"1. The case of Altar Lights was not before the Privy Council, and the opinion of 'Dr. ——' to the effect that the English Church has no Altar, is simply a lawyer's inference from a passage which will be found in *Ecclesiastical Judgments*, p. 144 sq.

"2. The passage is one which goes into theology, and affirms a doctrinal opposition between the ideas of Altar and Table. But if the Bishop maintains the binding force of all theological data which may be uttered in the name of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, he contradicts the explicit language of the Archbishop of York in his Pastoral to the Northern Province, and he debars himself from repudiating—what doubtless he would most sincerely repudiate—the theological dicta of Lord Westbury, in the *Essays and Reviews* case, on the question of Eternal Punishment.

"3. If the passage be of real legal force in the Church of

England; then that Church is committed to several extraordinary blunders, as can be very speedily demonstrated.

"(1.) The passage affirms a 'distinction in itself essential and deeply founded, between an Altar and a Communion-table.' By a Communion-table I presume to be meant 'the LORD's Table' of Holy Scripture. Does Scripture, then, consider the two phrases, 'Altar' and 'LORD's Table,' to exclude each other? The writer of the passage could hardly have said so if he had consulted Ezek. xli. 22:—'The Altar of wood was three cubits high, ... and he said to me, This is the Table that is before the LORD.' Or Ezek. xliv. 16:—'They (the Priests) shall enter into My Sanctuary, and they shall come near to My Table.' Or Mal. i. 7:—'Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine Altar: and ye say, Wherein have we polluted Thee? In that ye say, The Table of the LORD is contemptible.' Or Lev. xxiv. 6, 9, where the shew-bread, 'set upon the pure Table before the LORD,' is ranked among 'the offerings of the LORD.' Or above all, the well-known passage, 1 Cor. x. 18—21, where the parallelism between the Jewish Altar, the Table of demons (or Pagan Altar), and the Table of the LORD, would be totally without force, unless all three possessed at once the characters of Altar and Sacred Table. With this latter passage one may compare Isa. lxv. 11, 'that prepare a Table and furnish a drink-offering' for idols. Do not these Scriptural passages overthrow altogether the theological proposition that the two phrases are mutually opposed? And with any use of the Table other than these passages suggest, we of the English Church have nothing to do. Our 'Table' is *the Lord's*.

"(2.) The writer of these pages in the 'Judgment' ignores the fact that the Liturgies do not consider the two terms as opposed. For the Eastern Liturgies, which notoriously presuppose an Altar and an Eucharistic Sacrifice, use the phrase, 'Holy Table,' perhaps more frequently than 'Altar.' It is the rubrical phrase, so to speak, in S. Chrysostom's Liturgy. The Armenian uses the word 'Altar' in rubrics, *e. g.*, just before the Little Entrance, and just after it the Deacon, in a bidding prayer, speaks both of 'this Holy Table of GOD' and 'this Holy Altar of GOD.' I need not refer to the passages in S. Chrysostom's works, where the word 'Table' (although it seems to have been employed by only one ante-Nicene writer, S. Dionysius of Alexandria), is associated with the grandest expressions of his Eucharistic belief. But as to the Roman Church; on the hypothesis of the Privy Council writer, she ought to have proscribed the use of the word Table. She has done nothing of the kind. Turn over

the pages of the Missal: you will find in the 'Præparatio, 'Ad Mensam dulcissimi convivii Tui;' in the Post-Communion for Wednesday, in this present week of Lent (post Dom. tert. Quad.), 'Sanctificet nos . . . Mensa cœlestis;' in that for Rogation Sunday, 'Cœlestis Mensæ virtute satiatis;' in the Lauda Sion, 'In hac Mensa novi Regis.' And the Council of Trent, sess. 13, c. 8, speaks of 'Divinam hanc Mensam;' while any one who has looked at Roman books of devotion knows that 'Table' is repeatedly used in them with respect to Holy Communion, without the slightest consciousness of any contrariety between this use and that of 'Altar' in respect to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Maskell, in his *Monumenta Ritualia*, iii. 348, exhibits an old English (Mediæval) Exhortation to Communion, which four times uses the phrase 'GOD'S Board;' while Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* iii. 490, quotes a similar address in old French, which speaks of the 'Saint Sacrement de l'Autel,' and of the 'Table de notre SEIGNEUR.'

"(3.) The Privy Council writer said, 'The term "Altar" is never used,' in the present Prayer Book, 'to describe the Table.' I have already said that the Table of our Prayer Book is the LORD'S Table of Scripture, *i.e.*, a Table on which are laid things offered to GOD, and then designed to be consumed by man. Further, a Table on which 'Oblations' are laid is *ipso facto* an Altar. And the LORD'S Table in the Coronation Service is expressly called an Altar.

"(4.) The writer said, that a great change took place 'in the opinion of the English Church' before the introduction of the Second Book of Edward. He forgot that the Act of Parliament which introduced that Book pronounced the First to have been agreeable to the Word of GOD and the Primitive Church, and to have been objected against without good cause. Whatever this fact be worth, it should not be ignored. And if we talk of 'opinion,' I presume the opinion of the Caroline revisers, to whom we owe our present Prayer Book, was particularly distinct in regard to the Altar. (See, for instance, Sparrow.)

"(5.) The writer quoted a passage from Cudworth, to the effect that the LORD'S Supper is 'not a Sacrifice, but a Feast upon a Sacrifice: or else, in other words, not 'oblatio sacrificii,' but as Tertullian excellently speaks, *participatio sacrificii*; not the offering of something up to GOD upon an Altar, but the eating of something which comes from GOD'S Altar, and is set upon our Table.'

"Now, let us look at Cudworth's citation of Tertullian, which the Privy Council writer has endorsed. Cudworth quotes him

as if he meant that there was no 'Sacrificium' upon the LORD'S Table, but simply the partaking there of what had been offered up on the Cross. I hesitate not to say that the citation, if not scandalously dishonest, is scandalously careless. This is what Tertullian says, *De Oratione*, c. 19: 'Most persons think that on the Station-days (Wednesday and Friday) they ought not to attend the *Prayers of the Sacrifice*, because by the reception of the LORD'S Body the Station-fast would have to be broken. Does, then, the Eucharist break up a service of devotion to GOD? Does it not rather bind us to Him? Will not your Station be more solemn, if you shall also have stood *at God's Altar*? When *the Lord's Body* has been received and reserved, both are intact, both the *partaking of the sacrifice* and the performance of the duty' (*et participatio sacrificii et executio officii*). Now, what is Tertullian's 'participatio sacrificii?' The context answers:—The partaking of what has been offered on 'GOD'S Altar' and is 'the LORD'S Body.' Yet Cudworth, catching at two words, makes the sacrifice refer simply to the work wrought upon the Cross; and the Privy Council writer, unmindful of the duty of verifying his references, gives his sanction to a citation which the merest glance at the context is sufficient to expose. It is not maintainers of the Eucharistic Sacrifice that are damaged by this extract, but Cudworth and the Privy Council writer.

"And this tissue of errors, according to the argument of the Bishop of Ely, must be held to be of supreme authority in the Church of England. Oxford, March 5, 1866.

"P.S.—It is needless to add that much, if not all, of the opposition to the term 'Altar' connects itself with a dread of the notion of a reiteration, in the Eucharist, of the 'full and perfect' satisfaction made upon the Cross. That notion, of course, is simply and absolutely disclaimed by every orthodox believer in the Holy Sacrifice of the Eucharist. The Presentation of our LORD before His FATHER in Heaven, by His natural Presence (Heb. ix. 24, Rev. v. 6) and His Presentation in the Eucharist by a Presence ineffable and sacramental, alike presuppose the supremacy and uniqueness of the Calvary Sacrifice; and any notion derogatory to it is in very truth a 'blasphemous fable.'"

With regard to Archdeacon Freeman's pamphlet, whilst thanking him, as all religious Churchmen must do, for his noble plea for at least a weekly Celebration, and for his able defence of our full legitimate Ritual, I cannot refrain from adopting my dear

friend's protest against the singular notion maintained in pages 35—43, as also in the venerable Archdeacon's other most valuable work on *The Principles of Divine Service*. He thus writes:—

"It is painful to express dissent from one to whose labours Church literature owes a great debt of gratitude. But Archdeacon Freeman has reproduced in the midst of his valuable pamphlet (*Rites and Ritual*) in defence of Ritual, the very peculiar theory on the Eucharistic Presence which he advanced some years ago in his *Principles of Divine Service*. Taken literally, his statements (with one exception, of which more presently) imply an actual or objective Presence of CHRIST's Body and Blood, but of them (1), as they existed after death (2), as separate from His Person and Divinity, and therefore (3), not as adorable.

"1. Assuredly this hypothesis makes a greater demand on faith than any other view of the Eucharist known among men. It would be far easier to believe Transubstantiation in its most stringent form, than to hold a true Sacramental Presence of that which has been non-existent since the original Easter morning—the *Corpse* of JESUS CHRIST. He Who appears in the Apocalypse as 'the Lamb that was slain,' appears there as One that 'liveth and was dead, and is alive for evermore.' It is simply inconceivable that death could have any more dominion over His Manhood; that His Body could, in any true sense, return to a dead condition. In the words of a very able Scottish theologian, the theory involves 'a repetition of CHRIST's death, which the Church has always rejected with horror.'

"2. Nor, in the words of the same writer, could 'His Flesh, apart from His Soul and Divinity, be the instrument of our life.'

"3. But supposing, for a moment, that the Body and Blood of CHRIST could be present, apart from their principle of life, or could in such a case be life-giving, would that involve their being apart from His Divinity and His adorable Person? Assuredly not, if the Catholic Faith be true. That Faith teaches us that GODHEAD and Manhood were joined together in CHRIST's One Divine Person, 'never to be divided;' and it is a commonplace in Catholic theology, that the *Vital* Union of His Body and Soul was temporarily dissolved by death, but the *Personal* Union never. His GODHEAD, in which His Personality resides, was with the Body in the Sepulchre, and with the Soul in Paradise. 'Thou, O CHRIST,' says the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, 'wast in the grave bodily, in Hades spiritually.' There could not, since the first moment of the Incarnation, be the slightest severance

between His adorable Self and either element of His Humanity. To deny this truth, to affirm the possibility of such severance, is virtual Nestorianism.

"4. But His own words on this special point, that where His Flesh is, in any real sense, there in the same sense is His Person, are unequivocal. Having said, 'He that eateth My Flesh,' He proceeds with yet more awful emphasis: 'He that eateth *Me*.'

"5. But the Liturgies, we are told, do not speak of the presence of His adorable Person. Was it necessary that they should do so? His ordinary language, as to the Eucharistic gift, spoke of His Body or Flesh, and His Blood. The Liturgies reverently adopted this language; and they (as a rule) left the inference regarding His Person to the unfailing logic of Catholic faith and love. And that inference was universal. 'Eat, drink,' says the Autun inscription of the second century, 'holding in thy palms *IXΘTN'* (the accusative of *IXΘTΣ—i.e.*, JESUS CHRIST, the SON of GOD, the SAVIOUR). Not to mention the more ardent Easterns, we have Western Fathers, like S. Ambrose and S. Hilary, asserting that *ubi Corpus ejus ibi Christus est*, that *in illo Sacramento Christus est, quia Corpus est Christi*, or describing outrages against the Holy Sacrament as 'a putting forth of hands *in ipsum Christum*' (S. Ambr. in Ps. 118, § 8, s. 48; de Myst. 58; S. Hil. c. Const. 11). To call this 'warm, affectionate metonymy,' is but assumption. If a passage were produced from antiquity affirming that CHRIST'S Body was present apart from CHRIST, the cause that would gain by it would be that of the heresy condemned by the Third General Council.

"Upon this subject and in reference to the belief of the early Church, a remarkable testimony is afforded by the historian of the *Conversion of the Roman Empire*. Mr. Merivale, in his 'Boyle Lectures' for 1864, whilst showing how the 'godly example of the Christian completes the conversion,' writes thus:—'No private communion with the Invisible, no mystical union with Him, no ascetic devotion, no seclusion from the world, could release him from the duty of using and applying to his own particular case the public and general means of grace by seeking CHRIST at His own Temple, at His own Altar, in the Elements of an Eucharistic meal, at which His Presence was specially vouchsafed, in the midst of the congregation of believers like himself. The Christian then believed—and we believe it now—that at such Eucharistic Communion, a special virtue and grace were imparted to the faithful communicant. He believed in the Presence of CHRIST in His Temple, *upon His Altar*, in the Elements of Bread and Wine.' And even the heathen who cared

not, perhaps, to inquire into the idea of the Christian Mysteries . . . . could not fail to see in this belief thus publicly avowed . . . . in this sacramental act of faith and obedience . . . . an assurance that the obligations thereby imposed were not lightly undertaken, and would by none be lightly disregarded'—(pp. 159 and 160).

"6. But it is asked (in the Archdeacon's *Rites and Ritual*, p. 39), 'Why do we not pay Divine worship to the Church? for the Church certainly is His Body, His Flesh, and His Bones. Nay, why do we not worship the individual communicant? For he certainly has received not only CHRIST'S Body, but CHRIST'S very Self, to dwell within him.' Now (1) as to the communicant, in whose soul, after devout reception of CHRIST'S Body as dead, Archdeacon Freeman supposes a Presence of CHRIST Himself to take place by a sort of mystic resurrection analogous to the event of Easter Day (*Principles of Divine Service*, ii. pt. 1, p. 154), it is difficult to see how 'worshipping' *him* comes into the question, seeing that those against whom the Archdeacon argues never dream of worshipping the elements themselves. (2). As to the Church, the Presence which dwells in it is not properly sacramental, but is the result of a sacramental Presence. The Church, as S. Cyril of Alexandria and others have largely shown, is called CHRIST'S Body mystical, because it feeds on the mysterious reality of His Body and Blood in the Holy Eucharist. 'If,' says that holy and beloved teacher, who on Maundy Thursday was taken from us, 'the Eucharistical use of the term Body be merely parallel to the application of that term to the Church, it denotes no Real Presence of the Body which was born of the Virgin Mary' (Keble's *Considerations*, p. 19). And this *appears* to come out in one passage of *Rites and Ritual* (p. 73), where the Bread and Wine are spoken of as 'mysteriously, as regards *virtue or power*, identified with the Body and Blood;' whereas, in the *Principles of Divine Service* (vol. ii. pt. 1, p. 201), it was most positively affirmed that the Virtualistic theory was '*simply invented by Calvin* 300 years ago.'

"7. But he considers 'Eucharistic Adoration' to have been an afterthought with Anglo-Catholic writers in the last few years. All inferences, however legitimate, are in one sense afterthoughts; and, of course, men had first to own a true Presence of CHRIST'S Body (under non-material conditions wholly different from those of a 'natural' Presence), before they could argue from this to the Presence of CHRIST Himself, Who, wheresoever and howsoever present, must be *recognized* as adorable and Divine. But what has to be shown is, that any to whom sound Churchmen would

generally look up, admitted a Presence of CHRIST's Body, but denied a Presence of CHRIST Himself claiming such recognition. Mr. Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church* (vol. i., p. 401, 3rd edition, 1842), most clearly taught that 'as CHRIST's Divine and Human Natures are inseparably united, the English Church believes that we receive in the Eucharist, *not only* the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST, *but* CHRIST Himself, both GOD and MAN.' And this statement carries with it the principle of what is called 'Eucharistic Adoration.' As Mr. Keble has said, 'My LORD and my GOD' sums up the matter. So again Dr. Pusey's first Eucharistic Sermon, in 1843, contained, according to Archdeacon Freeeman, 'absolutely' nothing on this subject. But the sermon repeatedly affirms that where CHRIST's Flesh is, there *He* is; and Archdeacon Freeman's argument is without force, unless he can adduce ground for thinking that Dr. Pusey ever imagined a Presence of CHRIST to which 'adoration' was NOT due. It is difficult to suppose that there is more than one believing mind in England wherein such an imagination could find place.

"P.S.—With regard to the word 'Table,' it has been suggested by a writer of known ability and orthodoxy, that in 1 Cor. x. 21 it may be used metonymically for 'food,' as in the Greek of Daniel i. But where the ordinary sense can stand naturally and grammatically, why displace it? And here, not only *can* it stand, but it seems absolutely required by the marked parallelism between the LORD's Table, the Table of demons, and the Jewish Altar. I might have referred to the late Mr. Arthur Perceval's valuable *Letter to Dr. Arnold*, wherein he cites, on this very passage, the words of Bishop Andrewes: 'We know the rule of comparisons, they must be *ejusdem generis*.'

"It appears, then, that S. Paul meant by 'the LORD's Table,' that on which the Holy Sacrament of CHRIST's Body and Blood is offered up to GOD, and from which it is received in Communion. And this sense we are surely entitled and bound to claim as the Scriptural and legitimate sense of 'the LORD's Table,' or 'the Holy Table' in our Prayer Book. Any other sense, non-sacrificial, and therefore inadequate, which may have been assigned to the phrases by individuals of this period or of that, is really no concern of ours."

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD,

Easter, 1866.

Vows, and their relation to Religious Communities.

The general principles and sacred obligation of Vows, are plainly revealed in Holy Scripture. Not that their institution is recorded. The Law did not introduce them; but they are incidentally spoken of. Witness the case of Jacob's vow[1], in the annals of the earliest ages, as a religious ordinance in ordinary use; and again the Book of Job, which is identified with the most universal traditions of primæval revelation, where vows are classed among the simplest acts of personal religion. "Thou shalt make thy prayer unto Him, and He shall hear thee, and thou shalt pay thy vows[2]." They are to be regarded, therefore, as one of the many religious practices of patriarchal times, which being subsequently embodied in the Law, and regulated by its enactments, were thus invested with a fresh and more binding authority.

Vows recognized in the Mosaic Law, were either vows of devotion, or of abstinence. These are sometimes distinguished as vows affirmative and vows negative—the former implying some offering made to God, the other some restraint laid on the natural desires, or the use of certain things in themselves lawful[3].

There was no limit to the objects which a vow might embrace. Persons, lands, cattle, houses, and property of any sort, are either expressly or by implication included in the possible category of votive offerings. The only exceptions were the first-born of man or beast, and the property of priests. But these were excepted only as being already devoted to God. They were His by a

[1] Gen. xxviii. 18—22; xxxi. 5. [2] Gen. xxii. 27.

[3] There was a third kind of vow which does not properly fall within our consideration, viz. the vow of destruction, known in Hebrew under the term, *cherem*, or, as in the New Testament, *anathema*. It was an irrevocable curse, by which a man or his property might be devoted to destruction. It was designed to be an extreme punishment on the wicked, or for a signal warning. Jephtha's vow is considered by some as falling under this head; and, if so, it was a violation of the spirit and intent of the Law. The vow was meant to be a warning or judgment in regard to the wicked, and he used it as a means of thanksgiving or deprecation in the case of the innocent. Jahn, *Biblical Antiquities*, c. v. 394.

special covenant, the first-born as the representatives of the race which He had redeemed, the sacerdotal possessions as consecrated to His service. These exceptions, therefore, only the more strikingly proved that the subject-matter of vows was coextensive with every human personality or possession [4].

The Nazarite vow was of all others the most important, on account both of its own special provisions, and their symbolic significance. It is generally believed that the custom prevailed before the Mosaic period [5]. Only its peculiar regulations were provided for in the Law. The external obligations incurred by this vow were, to let the hair grow, to abstain from wine, vinegar, or any produce of the grape, even from grapes themselves, and to avoid all approach to a dead body, even that of the nearest relation.

It has been observed, and the point is of deep interest, as strikingly exhibiting the inner meaning of this remarkable self-consecration, that there is a close resemblance, as to their outward provisions, between the obligations of the Nazarite and those of the High Priest. The rule of avoiding all contact with the dead, and that of abstinence from wine, applied to both [6]. There is even ground for supposing that the Nazarite was permitted to enter the sanctuary, as bearing something of the priestly character, at least of the sanctity specially belonging to the sacred office [7]. Moreover, Jewish writers generally were of opinion that some deep spiritual import was involved in the Nazarite rule, though they differ as to its interpretation. Philo viewed it as expressive of spotless inward purity, and entire devotion of the person and his possessions. Some even regarded it as symbolizing the operation of the Divine Nature in man. That it embraced the whole life, and implied an entire consecration, was thought to be denoted by the provision, that at the completion of the vow, or a renewal in case of its being broken, the three chief

[4] For the laws regarding vows, see Levit. xxvii., Num. xxx.

[5] See Jahn's *Bibl. Antiq.*, c. v. sec. 394; also Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Article "Nazarite," sec. v.

[6] These injunctions were at least obligatory on the High Priest during his attendance at the altar.

[7] See Smith's *Dictionary*, Art. "Nazarite," iii. Maimonides is referred to, speaking of the dignity of the Nazarite in regard to his sanctity, as being equal to that of the High Priest. Also a passage of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 23, giving an account by Hegesippus of S. James the Just, that he was consecrated from his birth, neither to eat meat, or drink wine, or cut his hair; and that to him alone it was permitted to enter the sanctuary. It is also noticed that the same word used in the Hebrew text (Num. vi. 18) for "the hair of separation" of the Nazarite, is used for the anointed head, or "crown," of the High Priest.

sacrifices of the Law, the burnt-offering, the sin-offering, and the peace-offering, which together consecrated the whole man, were required. A Nazarite was understood to identify himself with each of these several acts of oblation. The shorn hair laid and burnt in the fire of the altar, was also, according to this deeper view, supposed to indicate that the person was offered to GOD,—the Divine law not permitting the offering of human blood, and the hair[8], as a portion of the person, being understood to represent the whole. That the idea implied is that of the setting apart of the life, a life-sacrifice to GOD, is in accordance with the Scriptural terms denoting the state; "The LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them; when either man or woman shall *separate* themselves to vow the vow of a Nazarite, to *separate themselves unto the Lord*[9]," &c. It was apparently the typical anticipation of the regenerate soul offering the "living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto the LORD." Some writers[1] of note have even supposed that the Nazarite rule was ordained as a quasi-sacramental representation of the condition of man before the fall; nor is it improbable that GOD would preserve on earth some visible sign of man's original creation, a state which knew not death, and which rested on the restraint of the appetites in subjection to the will, in harmony with the Divine law, when, as a priest, man lived before GOD, consecrating himself and all his possessions, as the highest offering of nature to its Creator.

The Nazarite rule embraced women as well as men. It was moreover applicable equally to limited periods of days or years, or to the whole life. The former case constituted the "Nazarite of days." Most commonly the vow was limited to a definite period; thirty, sixty, or a hundred days being ordinary terms. A touching instance is recorded of Helena, Queen of Œdiabene, a convert to Judaism, which illustrates both the kind of objects contemplated in the vow, and the strictness with which it was observed. She "took a vow for seven years, in order to obtain the Divine favour on a military expedition which her son was about to undertake. When her period of consecration expired, she visited Jerusalem, and was then informed by the doctors of the school of Hillel, that a vow taken in another country must be

[8] See Smith's *Dictionary*, Art. "Nazarite," to which I am indebted in this and other parts relating to the scriptural accounts of vows.

[9] Num. vi. 2. For the provisions of the Nazarite rule, see Num. vi.

[1] Lightfoot inclines to this view (Exercit. in Luc. i. 15). The passage is referred to in Smith's *Dictionary*, note to sec. iv., as well as by Magee, *Atonement and Sacrifice*, Illust. xxxviii.

repeated whenever the Nazarite might visit the Holy Land. She accordingly continued a Nazarite for a second seven years, and happening to touch a dead body just as the time was about to expire, she was obliged to renew her vow according to the law (Num. vi. 9). She thus continued a Nazarite for twenty-one years [2]."

Of Nazarites for life, the notable instances mentioned in Scripture are Sampson, Samuel, and S. John the Baptist, and in each case with the additional element of obedience to a superior will in the choice of the rule, the devotee accepting his consecration as the act of his parents, who were, we cannot question, moved by GOD to make this dedication of their child. Of the frequency of such life-devotion, we have no elements for forming any judgment. The three cases mentioned above are the only ones recorded, but nothing can be argued from the silence of Scripture as to the habits of individuals. That persons in the distinguished position of Judges of Israel should have thus lived in the midst of their people, would certainly indicate the probability of its not being a very unusual case.

That there was a tendency in the Jewish mind to such acts of self-devotion in order to win the favour of GOD, or deprecate His wrath, or for the cultivation of greater strictness of life, is evident from many tokens in their history. Beside the Nazarite rule, which had the highest possible sanction in the Revelations of GOD, other forms of self-consecration had grown up of themselves. The Institutes of the Rechabites and Essenes arose out of this tendency. Josephus records [3], that in his day there were many, particularly persons oppressed by sickness, or by adverse fortune, who vowed to abstain from wine and to go with the head shaven—their rule thus being distinguished from that of the Nazarite—and to spend a prolonged time in prayer during thirty days previously to their offering up the promised sacrifice.

Such vows, especially if undertaken only for short periods, would ordinarily pass almost unnoticed. "But the Nazarite for life must have been, with his flowing hair and persistent refusal of strong drink, a marked man. He may have had some privileges (as we have seen) which gave him something of a priestly character, and (as it has been conjectured) he may have given up much of his time to sacred studies. Though not necessarily cut off from social life, when the turn of his mind was devotional, consciousness of his peculiar dedication must have influenced

[2] Smith's *Dictionary*, sec. i.

[3] Jewish War, II. 15. i.; quoted by Jahn, *Bibl. Antiq.*

his habits and manner, and in some cases probably led him to retire from the world[4]."

Voluntariness is always spoken of as an essential characteristic of a vow; and its subject-matter some devotion left free to the conscience. It was the willing adoption of a rule of life not enjoined by the Law, but revealed as pleasing to GOD, and expressive of some high truth by which the soul might aspire to greater nearness to Him. That a parent could dedicate his child, is not at variance with this principle; because it was assumed that the child, when capable of a choice, would willingly concur in the dedication. But though wholly voluntary before the choice was made, it became, when made and uttered "before the LORD," solemnly binding. The expressions of Holy Scripture on both these points are strong and unmistakeable. "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the LORD thy GOD, thou shalt not slack to pay it: for the LORD thy GOD will surely require it of thee; and it would be sin in thee." And again; "*That which is gone out of thy lips* thou shalt keep and perform; even a *free-will offering*, according as thou hast vowed unto the LORD thy GOD, which thou hast promised with thy mouth[5]."

The term, "before the LORD," had a deep significance in the faith of Israel. He was believed in, and dealt with, as a personal GOD, with Whom definite relations could be formed, by which His own dealings also would be influenced. The idea involved in the vow, was that of a definite contract or covenant, entailing a whole series of after consequences, depending on the conditions being fulfilled; a promise and an acceptance mutually sealed, by which both parties in the covenant were affected. A momentous reality attached to the uttered word, beyond what the thought of the heart could express. The utterance gave it a palpable shape and being, and thus constituted a reality of existence, sealing its truth beyond recall. The instinct which to the human consciousness invests a word with a power and a life beyond the unspoken thought, is evidently an indication of some profound truth in the spiritual world, and is assumed in the Revelations of GOD as the turning-point of the obligations incurred by a vow. It lives "before the LORD," when spoken, as it did not live before, an image as it were of the outward form of the life of GOD, projected forth and impressed on the mind of man, uniting him with GOD. Even as GOD comes forth out of Himself to make a covenant with His creature, and

[4] Smith's *Dictionary*, vii.

[5] Deut. xxiii. 21. 23; see also Num. xxx. 2; see also Eccles. v. 4, 5; Prov. vii. 14; Ps. xxii. 25, &c.

confirms it by an oath, thus establishing it "by two immutable things, in which it is impossible for GOD to lie," so man may go forth from himself and bind himself, sealing the covenant by his promise. As he speaks the purpose of his heart, it assumes a substantial existence in Heaven, which stands before GOD as a witness for or against the soul which has uttered the word, and thus committed itself to all its consequences. This objective reality gives to a vow its intensity of obligation, while the consciousness of such momentous issues must needs inspire an awful sense of responsibility in venturing to make it.

The laws of the Mosaic code, which permitted and regulated the redemption or commutation of vows, have a material bearing on the question of their obligation, and need carefully to be weighed; but they will more conveniently come under our view, when the power of dispensing vows under the Christian covenant is taken into consideration.

It is one among the many signs which so strikingly indicate the unity of principle binding together the Mosaic and the Christian covenants—the one embodying the symbolic, the other the substantial, realization of the Divine life in man—that the votive offerings of the Israelites still found their place in the earliest laws of Christianity; that even an Apostle was himself bound by, and shared in the fulfilment of, a strictly legal ceremonial[6]. The use did not survive the apostolic age; but S. Paul's practice marks unmistakeably his view of the unbroken continuity of the system of vows under both dispensations. The ancient forms passed away, but their hidden power and meaning were perpetuated, under other forms, unchangeably.

No fresh enactments, indeed, as to the use of vows are to be found in the New Testament; nor are any other modes of binding the soul's free choice enforced as part of its system. It is not the principle of the Gospel to enact provisions similar to the

[6] The vow by which S. Paul himself was bound (Acts xviii. 18), was clearly not a Nazarite vow. "He shaved his head at Cenchrea, for he had a vow;" i. e. at the commencement, not, as in the case of the Nazarite, at the close of the period over which the vow extended. It appears to have been a vow such as Josephus speaks of in a passage lately referred to in the text. Neander supposes it to have been an expression of thanksgiving, or of humiliation, on account of some recent illness. The vow (Acts xxi. 24), of which he bore "the charges," was a true Nazarite vow. He joined four poor men during the last seven days of their consecration, when their hair was cut off in the usual form, out of charity, assisting them in making the appointed offerings, according to a custom common with the devout.

details of the Levitical code, as to points which concern the free operations of the Spirit. It was left, as in similar cases, to the Church in her subsequent development under the guidance of the HOLY GHOST, to form regulations which might adapt to changing circumstances of time and place, these secret inspirations of the life of GOD within the souls of His elect. The Gospel was especially distinguished from the Law in this, that while the latter was in all cases characterized by a most careful organization of outward ceremonial, the former, if we except the case of Sacraments, simply revealed the existence of the new powers which were to transform the life of our regenerate nature, such powers possessing in themselves the faculty of shaping and determining their outward forms. Thus, in the case of vows, the new covenant clearly sets forth the states of life which are the subject-matter of vows; but the modes of their expression, the rules which distinguish or determine them, the institutions which are either founded on, or guarded by their operation—all such practical details were left to be settled by Church legislation, or individual choice.

The law of celibacy is the most prominent, and necessarily attracts the chief attention. Our LORD Himself first announced this law. Having explained the true idea of marriage, as a pure and indissoluble union—an explanation which startled the Apostles, imbued with the lax traditions of Rabbinical casuistry—He immediately afterwards spoke of the virgin state, as a characteristic note of His kingdom. He asserted the creative power of the SPIRIT, in those who, being predestined to such a state, willingly devoted themselves to it by an irreversible act. "There are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake;" adding, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it[7]." That a permanent state of life was intended, is evident by the parallel which S. Paul also draws between the virgin, and the married life. Contrasting "the married" who "careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband," with "the unmarried" who "careth for the things of the LORD, how she may please the LORD[8]," he assumes as an accepted fact, that they are two distinct and equally defined states, or "callings" of GOD.

The rule of the Essenes, which involved celibacy, except in a limited section of their body, although it probably furthered the adoption of the celibate life among the early Christians, can yet

[7] S. Matt. xix. 12. [8] 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.

hardly be viewed as opposed to the view here expressed of the virgin state being a new creation in CHRIST. The Essene rule was but a rudimentary anticipation of the Christian system, a feeling of nature after this high aim of self-dedication. It had grown up apparently without any sanction from the Law, and was accompanied with a false notion of the necessary impurity of matter. Virginity, as a specially sacred state, had moreover been from the beginning dimly revealed through the Virgin-birth foretold as the hope of redeemed humanity. Many a Hebrew mother had, as a fruit of this promise, carried the idea of a spiritual virginity into the married state. But this too can only be regarded as a shadowy prefiguring of the law, which waited for the SPIRIT'S Advent to become a calling, an abiding state of life.

The term, μέρις, or "portion," employed by S. Paul in connexion with his argument in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, though its meaning is obscured in our version, confirms the view here expressed. The same term is employed by our LORD in S. Luke, in reference to Mary of Bethany. The "good *part*, which shall not be taken away from her[9]," is literally the portion, or "lot." What in our version is translated, "There is a difference between a wife and a virgin," is in the original, μεμέρισται ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος[1], and is explained by Dr. Wordsworth to mean; "Both the wife has been assigned to her appointed lot (μέρις), or special portion, and the unmarried woman to hers; and GOD has allotted to each their appointed duties;" or more briefly; "The married woman has her part assigned to her, and the virgin hers." This term appears to be used by S. Paul as synonymous with κλῆσις, "calling," which he had used shortly before (vv. 25—28), when exhorting every one to abide in the "same calling wherein he was called." In that passage μέρις occurs in close connexion with κλῆσις; "As GOD hath divided (ἐμέρισεν) to every man, as GOD hath called (κέκληκεν) every man, so let him walk, and so ordain I in all the churches[2]" (v. 17). The idea of a

[9] 1 Cor. vii. 34. [1] S. Luke x. 42.

[2] "S. Paul had been speaking of the different callings which God has allotted or apportioned (ἐμέρισεν, v. 17; see also 1 Cor. x. 13) to different persons in life. And he had said; "Let every one abide in the state of life to which GOD has called him; (v. 24), and he here describes the characteristics of the several μερίδες, or portions (compare S. Luke x. 42, τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα), which the married and unmarried have assigned to them respectively. He does not depreciate the one in comparison with the other, but states the fact that they have special lots or portions in life."—Dr. Wordsworth *in loco*. Dr. Wordsworth's witness to the power of these words is the more important, because he had in a previous note spoken unfavourably of religious vows.

permanent state, or abiding, occurs again shortly afterwards, where S. Paul refers (v. 37) to a father's conduct towards his daughter; "He that standeth stedfast in his heart (ἕστηκεν ἑδραῖος), having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well." The daughter's mind is evidently supposed to be expressed through the father's, though the decision is represented as his. "The virgin daughter's resolves are blended in one with the parent's, but the parent gives expression to them[3]." The same idea of a binding law is expressed again by S. Paul, in reference to the "widows," whom he censures, as having devoted themselves, and then abandoned their profession. Such desertion is regarded by the Apostle as "a waxing wanton against CHRIST,"—"having damnation, because they have cast off their *first faith*[4]," i. e., the voluntary self-dedication in which they had pledged their troth.

A material point to note in reference to these various expressions is, that the life described is not spoken of as desired merely because of its advantage, as a more undivided service than is possible to one bound by home ties, and absorbed in domestic duties. This advantage is indeed unavoidably included in the idea, and forms a part of the reason inclining the soul to its adoption, because, the "things of the LORD" may be more entirely cared for, as the better means of "pleasing the LORD." But this is viewed only as an incidental benefit. Beneath this outward form of service, the inner life is viewed as a state preferable for its own sake, irrespectively of any special work. It is evidently regarded as a new creation of grace, a note of the kingdom of GOD, a fruit of His own Presence in the flesh, one among the Sacramental gifts in which the results of the Incarnation are manifested, through the SPIRIT'S indwelling power; a calling of GOD which implies a fixed disposition of the soul, sealing and consecrating the whole person through a willing and deliberate choice, corresponding with the Divine predestination. Its permanency is involved in the terms employed. The contrast is drawn between

[3] Dr. Wordsworth. The same conclusion thus drawn from the later history of the New Testament, which describes the Christian life in its actual operation, as a fuller development of the principle of the virgin state briefly enunciated by our Lord, might be proved equally as to the case of poverty. The community life described in the opening scenes of the Acts of the Apostles—"And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need" (ch. ii. 44, 45)—was the natural consequence of the call uttered by our Lord—"Go, and sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow Me; and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."

[4] 1 Tim. v. 11, 12.

it and marriage, which now, for the first time since its original institution in Paradise, is declared to be indissoluble. And in like manner, celibacy is announced as a perpetuation of our LORD's own likeness, in following Him by a special vocation, so that His own virgin state should abide as a law of life in those whom He would draw to Himself by this bond of union. As a reflection of the life of our LORD, it must needs be an abiding grace, partaking of His own unchangeableness, because an operation of His own Spirit, derived from His own Person. Its permanence, therefore, in those who are thus specially called, rests not on their choice, but on His election. It thus partakes of an enduring grace, sustained by an actual union with Himself, the Source of grace; and is perpetual as the life of our regeneration, being in fact a special endowment within the order of the regenerate life, and as undying, when truly His gift, as the grace by which we are preserved in a state of salvation.

This contrasted likeness, which the words both of our LORD Himself and His Apostle expressly represent, between marriage and consecrated virginity, has left its deep and enduring impression on the mind of the Church. That the Church of the elect, the entire mystical Body, is alone in Scripture spoken of in express terms as the "Bride," "the Lamb's wife," is evident[5]. It is also clear, that every elect soul is dignified with the high distinction of being "a chaste virgin to CHRIST[6]." Nothing, therefore, can interfere with these distinct assertions. But still, an instinct has always pervaded the Church's mind, and is expressed again and again in the writings of the Saints, that the devoted life has a special sacramental position of its own, in union with the LORD, the marriage-vow being viewed as its standing type and earthly witness. Without any derogation to Christian marriage, the consecrated virgin's spiritual bond with the LORD has been viewed under that sacred image, as a heavenly reality—the previous drawing of love, the espousals, the sealing, the festal joy, the enduring, indissoluble oneness, each and all have been felt to have their true spiritual counterpart in the betrothal of CHRIST and His own elect[7]. There may have been exaggeration in the expression of these feelings, but its groundwork was unquestionably laid in no obscure terms in the inspired language on which we have been dwelling.

The Gospel, as already observed, deals with internal forces, not with their outward expression. Their modes of expression, and laws of action, were left to the care of the Church, under the

[5] Rev. xxi. 9. [6] 2 Cor. xi. 2.

[7] See Dr. Pusey's Address at the Oxford Congress.

guidance of the HOLY GHOST. This, in some measure, is the case even with the Sacraments. The vows of Baptism were not ordained; they are the results of its own inherent gift of life, expressing its own consciousness of a perpetual obligation. Thus, again, with Confirmation. Its grace and outward form only are revealed; the vow, by which the confirmed bind themselves to fulfil its obligations, was left to its own natural development. The sacramental grace of marriage was revealed; but its vows are the mind of the Church interpreting its duties. Thus, likewise, what are technically called "Vows of Religion," are not ordained in the New Testament; they are but the utterances of the inner life therein revealed, assuming a palpable shape from the informing grace within, not necessary to its existence, not necessarily to be expressed under any particular form. The law of vows needed not to be ordained, when the living powers which they only outwardly express were secured. The state of life was the real question at issue; its vocal utterance was never intended to assume the character of a legal bondage. It was part of the freedom of the SPIRIT, to vow or not to vow, or in whatsoever form to vow. Its roots of living energy, and bond of union with the LORD of Life, were independent of any special forms of outward utterance.

These conclusions, drawn from Holy Scripture, have been thus fully dwelt upon, because they must necessarily constitute the basis of the law of the Church, and be continually appealed to, as the guide and indispensable sanction of its judgments. The historical development of these principles naturally comes next under our view.

In the history of the Religious life we may trace three distinct periods; (1) that of the simple informal condition of the self-devoted, either solitary, or dwelling amidst the ties of home life; (2) that of Communities, more or less formally constituted, and bound by the general obligations implied in the state itself; and (3) that of Orders or Congregations, of which the three vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, more or less binding, according to the rule of the society, form the essential features.

This progressive development might have been expected. The simple expression of the pure Divine life, needing no rule or restraint, because it was its own sufficient law, would naturally follow the first outpouring of the SPIRIT. This would as naturally be succeeded by a growing tendency to cast around itself the protection of recognized forms and securities of discipline, especially as love waxed cooler, and the world intermin-

gled with the communion of the elect. Later still would arise an increasing definiteness and stringency of formal enactments, as increased knowledge taught fresh methods, or worldly influences necessitated a more careful guarding, till, as a natural reaction, the form would tend to take the place of the spirit, and a return to first principles become necessary, in order to adjust the system to the relative claims of conflicting duties, to preserve itself from dangers to which experience had proved it to be liable.

The history of Religious Communities is beyond our province. It is only necessary to illustrate the progress of the Religious life, so far as it bears upon the system which culminated in the three distinctive vows.

The earliest records relate to devoted women, and of these there were three classes—Widows, Virgins, and Deaconesses. The Deaconess was rather an office for Church-work than a state of life; and generally the selection was made from among the Widows or Virgins. We may therefore dismiss the idea of the Deaconess from our view. The term, Widow, was often used technically, and applied to denote consecrated Virgins also. This usage was probably owing to the traditional sanctity attached to the term by S. Paul's use of it[8], as also in consequence of the greater number of those who at the beginning devoted themselves to the Religious life, being of this class. But the consecrated Virgins grew rapidly in number and importance, and at last outnumbered the Widows, properly so called. These devoted women were distinguished by various names, marking their separateness and public recognition, as, e. g., *παρθένοι ἐκκλησιαστίκαι*, and *ἀναγεγραμμέναι*, or *canonicæ*, implying that their names were enrolled in the canon or list of the Church. They lived privately at home, or alone (*monachæ*). From very early times—though the actual commencement of the custom cannot be determined—the Virgin was solemnly consecrated by the Bishop in Church, during the cele-

[8] 1 Tim. v. 9. The writer is indebted to Provost Fortescue for the striking remark, that "probably the habit of female Religious, which, in its general character, is identical both in East and West, is simply the dress of a widow assumed for another purpose, in consequence of the earliest Religious having been widows." S. Ignatius addresses, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, *τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας*. Some have thought that the age at which S. Paul advises the admission of Widows to the Church roll, sixty years, is conclusive against an earlier consecration of a Sister. But the difference of the two cases neutralizes the argument. There was the temptation of the alms of the Church acting in the case of the Apostolic Widows. They dwelt in the midst of the world, subject to its influences. Moreover the variety which prevailed in early times as to the age of admission proves that the Church did not understand any limit to self-devotion to be implied by these words of the Apostle.

bration of the holy Eucharist, after a public profession of self-devotion. Among other ceremonies, that of giving the veil formed the most significant part, so that to veil a virgin became synonymous with consecrating or dedicating her. There is no record of any vow during these earliest times. The public profession of the resolved purpose was tantamount to a vow. They were, as Fell has observed in his Annotations on S. Cyprian, "animi proposito et publicâ virginitatis professione, non voto, astrictæ[9]," "bound, not by a vow, but by the purpose of the mind, and public profession of virginity." The simple bond of their own inner choice constituted the security of their state, not any special promises. Even when formed into Communities, as under S. Pachomius in Egypt, the monks took no vow. Their rule was in the nature of a private instruction for the inner discipline of their life, not of a legislative code constituting or expressing a formal obligation. The promise was implicit, within the conscience only.

The mind of the Church was always opposed to the abandonment of such a profession, and after a time this sentiment expressed itself in her penitential codes. The Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, first subjected its abandonment to a penance equal to that of a double marriage, a period of one or two years. The Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, excommunicated such as drew back from the Religious life, if they married, leaving the term of penance to the discretion of the Bishop[1]. But such marriages during this period were not considered null[2]. The Church,

[9] Note in Cypr. Ep. iv., quoted by Bingham, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, c. vii. sec. ii.

[1] (Bingham, *Ecclesiastical Antiquities*, c. viii. sec. 3.) Canon XVI. distinctly excommunicates monks and professed virgins who marry. The earlier rule of the Church, as far as it can be gathered from the Apostolical Institutions, left the question of penance undetermined, while yet clearly asserting the same principle of the permanence of the devoted state. The closing chapter of the Fourth Book runs thus:—"Concerning Virginity we have received no command, but we commit the matter to the free action of those who desire it, giving them this advice as our prayer, not to promise any thing hastily, since Solomon says, 'Better it is that thou shouldest not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay.' Let the virgin then be free in body and soul as the temple of God, as the dwelling of Christ, as the shelter of the Holy Ghost. For 'she who vows, if she act in a manner worthy of her vow, ought to prove that her vow is a genuine one, and made for the sake of leisure in holiness, not through contempt of marriage.'"

[2] S. Augustine writes strongly on this point, while as strongly asserting the permanence of the call to the virgin state;—"Since as the Lord saith, *not all receive this word;* therefore let her who can receive it, receive it; and let her, who containeth not, marry; let her who hath not begun, deliberate; let her who hath undertaken it, persevere; let there be no occasion given unto the adversary; let there be no oblation withdrawn from Christ. Forsooth in the marriage bond, if chastity be preserved, condemnation is not

while imposing penance, ratified the marriage; but the censure sufficiently implied the belief, that it was a putting the hand to the plough, and looking back. During the fourth and fifth centuries the Church's censures increased in stringency. At the same time the civil law interfered, though in no hostile spirit, to guard, not without cause, against the case of young women being forced to be veiled "by the violence or hatred of their parents." The imperial laws gave special liberty and indulgence to such as were veiled before the age of forty[3]. The Church itself varied as to the permissible age of consecration. Some canons, as, e.g., those of Carthage, allowed veiling at twenty-five, others as early as sixteen. The French Council of Agde, however, and the Spanish Council of Saragossa, limited it to forty. S. Leo decreed that women should not receive the solemn benediction with the veil before the age of forty, a decree confirmed by the Emperor, A.D. 458.

The second period indicated above, is marked by the rule of the great Apostle of Western Monachism, S. Benedict. It dates A.D. 528. The formation of this rule was a crisis in the history of Religious Communities. Not that S. Benedict's rule was the commencement of monastic institutions. The East took the lead of the West. S. Basil's rule is the most ancient now actually in practice, as the Basilian Order is that which still holds its ground

feared, but in widowed and virginal continence the excellence of a greater gift is sought for; and when this has been sought and chosen, or by debt of vow offered, from this time not only to enter upon marriage, but although one be not married, to wish to marry, is matter of condemnation. For in order to show this, the Apostle saith not, *when they shall have lived in delights* in Christ, they marry; but if they wish *to marry, having*, saith he, *condemnation*, in that they have made *of none effect their first faith*, although not by marrying, but by wishing; not that the marriages even of such are judged matter of condemnation; but there is condemned a wrong done to the purpose, there is condemned a broken faith of vow, there is condemned, not a relief by lower good, but a fall from higher good; lastly, such are condemned, not because they have entered upon marriage faith afterwards, but because they have made of none effect the first faith of continence. And in order to suggest this in few words the Apostle would not say, that they have condemnation, who after purpose of greater sanctity marry (not because they are not condemned, but lest their marriage itself should be thought to be condemned), but after he had said, *they wish to marry*, he straightway added, *having condemnation*, in that *they have made of none effect their former faith*, in order that it may appear that it is the will which fell away from its purpose, which is condemned, whether marriage follow, or fail to follow." *De Virgi.*

[3] But in securing this freedom the Theodosian code implied a recognition of the ordinary inviolability of such a profession. It only asserted that, "No virgin should be judged sacrilegious, who by her honest marriage declared that either she never intended to take upon her any such vow, or at least was unable to fulfil it." Quoted by Bingham, c. vii. sec. 5.

in the Churches of Greece and Russia. But S. Basil's rule contained no promise of perpetuity. It was framed on the primitive principle of the state of life being itself a sufficient profession. The Saint, explaining his rule, says[1]: "There was no express promise of celibacy taken of any, but they seemed only to promise it tacitly by becoming monks." But he advised "that a profession should be required in future[1]." S. Benedict adopted this suggestion. He required of his monks a distinct vow of "stability" in their profession: "The novice was committed to the care of an aged Religious, experienced in the art of winning souls, who was charged with the duty of studying carefully his vocation and character, and to forewarn him of the disappointments, difficulties, and humiliations which he would have to encounter in the rugged path of obedience. If after two months he promised to persevere, the entire rule was read over to him, and the reading closed with these words: 'Behold the law under which you desire to contend; if you can observe it, enter, if not, you are free to depart.' Three times, during the course of a year, this same test was repeated. At the expiration of the year, if the novice persevered, he was warned that henceforth he was no longer free to quit the monastery, and release himself from the rule which he had accepted after such mature deliberation. He was told that he was about to forfeit all independence. Being led into the Oratory, in the presence of the whole community, he then made before GOD and the Saints the vow of 'stability,' or perpetual continuance, beside the reformation of life, and obedience, under pain of eternal damnation. He wrote this promise with his own hand, and laid it on the Altar, and then prostrated himself at the feet of each of the Brothers, asking their prayers. He was then received as a professed member of the Community." Montalembert, from whose work this account is derived, adds: "Nearly all the ancient monks admitted some sort of noviciate, and different vows, more or less formal. But nothing had as yet been introduced of this solemn and imposing character. The profession had been generally made by the mere fact of taking the monastic habit; and examples of this custom occur even after the time of S. Benedict. But the vow of 'stability' imposed by the new legislator, which no previous rule had prescribed, was an innovation as felicitous as it was eventful, and it became one of the principal guarantees of the development and power (*d'avenir et de force*) of the cœnobitic life."

Moreover, no material or legal restraint had as yet been

[1] Quoted from S. Basil's Ep. Can., c. xix., by Bingham, c. vii. sec. 7.

introduced to bind the Religious to his vow. "They even preserved his secular garments to be restored to him, if, by any misfortune or evil chance (*malheur*), he desired to quit the monastery[5]." Montalembert notes, that this vow was not introduced until grievous scandals and disorders had called for the interposition of stringent discipline, and the control of a powerful authority.

S. Gregory the Great, the first monk raised to the papal chair, about fifty years after the death of S. Benedict, was a great reformer of monasteries. Among other disciplinary measures, he extended the noviciate, forbidding the tonsure, the sign of the consecration of the man, as the veil was of the woman, till the fitness of the novice had been proved by a testing of not less than two years[6]. With this only change, the Benedictine rule was adopted throughout the West, and determined for many centuries the constitution of Religious Communities, resting for their security, as we have seen, on the simple promise of "stability," with liberty to the professed to depart if they so desired, but with the prospect of excommunication, and other censures, to enforce which successive Councils were continually enacting fresh canons[7].

The third period was marked by the establishment of the great Religious Orders of the Middle Ages. The change which then took place consisted mainly in the substitution, for the simple promise of stability, of the three vows of celibacy, poverty, and

[5] *The Monks of the West*, by Le Comte de Montalembert, vol. ii. pp. 59, 60.

[6] Montalembert, Ibid., vol. ii. 170. S. Gregory resisted an abuse then beginning to creep into monasteries, of admitting a monk who had deserted his wife, forbidding his admission without her consent and simultaneous conversion to the Religious life. A touching story is recorded of S. Gregory, which graphically marks the temper of the times, as well as his own mode of dealing in the case of a breach of vow. An intimate friend of his, and brother monk, a patrician by rank, wearied of the monastic life, had quitted the monastery and married. When S. Gregory became Pope, he wrote in most affectionate terms, remonstrating and reminding him of his desertion, which he compared with the case of Ananias, keeping back what he had offered, and conjuring him to come to him, to take counsel with him, or if he distrusted him, to submit himself to the judgment of the Church. His friend was deaf to his appeals. But S. Gregory continued to write with the same affection to him as well as to his wife. When the wife died, he urged the Bishop of Syracuse, where his friend lived, to press on him, now on his death-bed, to resume the monastic habit; and after his death, S. Gregory took under his special protection his two daughters, who were left in great difficulties. He wrote to them himself, caused them to come to Rome, and became as a father to them, addressing them, as "dulcissimæ filiæ," (Ep. xi. p. 35.)

[7] For the chief facts concerning the early history of the Religious life, see Bingham's *Eccles. Hist.* B. VII. c. iii., iv.; also Montalembert's *Monks of the West*. See also a very interesting brief digest, by Dr. Littledale, of *Religious Communities of Women in the Early Church*.

obedience,—principles of life always implied in the profession itself, but now first expressed in distinct promises, and secured by an increased severity of enactment. The Religious profession had become more completely separate from social life, and laws were passed involving even civil penalties. It became, during this period, a well-known maxim of English jurisprudence, that whoever had taken on himself monastic vows, and was once professed in any Religious Order, was dead in law, incapable of inheriting property or executing any civil function. Marriage in such case was not merely irregular, but absolutely illegal and null, and the children were illegitimate. Admission into any Order also annulled a previous contract of marriage, if not actually consummated.

The age at which monks or nuns could be professed still varied. The rule of the Benedictines fixed the age at twenty. Les Chartreux followed the same rule. Pius V., A.D. 1570, decreed the age of nineteen for the Franciscans. The Council of Trent forbad vows being taken before sixteen, or without a noviciate of at least one year. In France, A.D. 1768, a declaration of the King limited the age, in the case of women, to eighteen, of men, to twenty-one [8]. The consent of parents was by rule desired, but was not considered necessary [9].

Jeremy Taylor notes this latter point as marking an epoch of decline in the constitution of Religious Communities. "Thomas Aquinas entered into the Dominican Order, and became a friar without the consent of his parents; and that unjustifiable action begat a more unjustifiable doctrine,—'That after fourteen years of age, or the first ripeness (*annos pubertatis*), it is lawful for children to take upon them vows of Religion, whether their parents be willing or unwilling.'" (Bellarm., lib. 2, *De Monachis*, cap. 36.) "And after his time it grew into a common doctrine and practice [1]."

[8] *Traité de l'État Religieux*, by Le P. E. Gautrelet, Tome premier, p. 115.

[9] Gautrelet thus resolves the question.

[1] *Rule of Conscience;* of laws domestic, Rule viii. sec. 3. Taylor adduces canons of Councils and examples of Saints, as to the regard anciently held to be due to parents and nearest relations. Among other cases he adduces S. Basil, saying, "Children are not to be received into monasteries, unless their parents present them;" and S. Gregory Nazianzen, who, having against his father's commandment run into a monastery, began to bethink himself of what he had done, and found that without impiety he could not be contumacious to his father, and therefore left his solitude and returned home, and begged his father's forgiveness and blessing; also the case of Heliodorus, who, together with S. Jerome, had undertaken a monastical life by vow; but

A critical question, fairly open to discussion, is here at stake, however contrary such a rule, when thus broadly stated, must be judged to be to the simple laws of moral duty. A call of GOD, if truly such, cannot but overrule all earthly authority; and parents may be unwilling to recognize the Divine Will and make the sacrifice which the surrender of a child involves. The Church, claiming as a Divine institution to make known the Will of GOD to the soul, asserted its right to judge the signs of a true vocation, and justify the self-dedication of one whom it deemed truly called. But the law of submission to parents at so early an age, has an absolute sacredness, no exception being recognized in the Divine law. The parent may err in the refusal, but the child's duty is clear. It is not to be supposed, however, that the words of Bellarmine are to be understood without modification. The Council of Trent limits the freedom of the child, when it subjects to excommunication, "those who *without cause* hinder a woman from taking the veil, or making vows." Billuart, commenting on this canon, states that parents are not to be blamed, if a just cause exists, rather that they are to be praised, if their object is only to interpose delay, in order to test the reality and constancy of a child's purpose; yet with a warning against protracting the trial too long, or indulging the desire to thwart the purpose under the pretext of testing it[2].

finding that by piety and nature he was to regard his only sister and her son, he returned to her home, and took upon him the habit of the clergy, and left that of monks. Against him S. Jerome, who was then a young man newly come from the University and the Schools of rhetoric, storms very much, and says some things which, when he was older and wiser, he changes and revokes, as appears in his epistle to Nepotian, where he imputes his former sayings to his juvenile years and learning.

[2] See Billuart's *Summa S. Thomæ*, vol. viii. Dissert. ii. Art. iii., sub fin. Gautrelet argues the question at length. He shows that Roman authorities are divided on the subject. S. Thomas Aquinas, indeed, takes the extreme line. He asserts that relations are even purposely to be excluded from giving advice, because of the danger of their tendency to dissuade from such a purpose; and Liguori considers it an imprudence in a child consulting a parent on such a point. But other writers are quoted as asserting, on the contrary, the positive duty of a child to consult a parent. The general conclusion, however, seems to be, to give the liberty of an unfettered choice on the question of a Religious vocation, so far at least as to set aside a parent's right to exert a positive influence. Gautrelet sums up the discussion thus:—"À coup sûr nous nous reprocherions la moindre insinuation capable de diminuer le respect qu'ils doivent à leur parents; nous les incitons à observer dans toute sa perfection le commandment que Dieu lui-même nous fait d'aimer et d'honorer les auteurs de nos jours; mais cet amour ne doit jamais nous porter à sacrifier, pour ne pas les déplaire, notre âme et notre avenir, notre conscience et la perfection à laquelle nous sommes appellés." (*Traité*. vol. i., pp. 51—55.)

Out of this later and more formal system arose the distinction between vows simple and solemn. The difference turns on the meaning intended by the Church, or the mutual understanding between the Community and the person professed, and on the outward circumstances and canonical or legal effects which the vows involve.

Both alike are promises made and accepted before GOD. Both are understood to be the expression of the true inner choice of the soul after a due probation, and with free consent. Both embrace the same extent of obligation, as embodied in the threefold profession of celibacy, poverty, obedience. The distinction rests on the comparative degrees of unchangeableness implied in the one or the other, according to the judgment of the Church. The solemn vow is that made in an Order, or Society approved by the Church, or rather the Pope in her name. The simple vow is one made in a Congregation, i. e. a Society approved only by a Bishop, and not constituted an Order by Papal sanction. The difference of effect, however, in the two cases is of the most momentous character. The simple vow can be, and often is, dispensed by the Bishop; the solemn vow can be dispensed only by the Pope, and this only in the rarest cases (*presque jamais*)[3]. This distinction is sufficient for all practical purposes,

[3] Gaume, *Catéchisme de Persévérance*, t. iv. p. 404. Gautrelet and all modern authors of authority give the same interpretation. The Schoolmen varied in their definition. S. Thomas Aquinas and the Thomists thus briefly state the distinction. The simple vow consists "in simplice permissione;" the solemn "in permissione simul et traditione absolutâ et irrevocabili atque reciproci acceptatione factâ ab habente legitimam auctoritatem." The "traditio" and "acceptatio," are supposed to constitute the ground of the solemnity. But this makes the difference to depend on the mere form or ceremonial attending the profession. Other schoolmen suppose the solemnity to consist in the Church's statute law determining its effects, e. g., as to the nullity of marriage, or inability to possess property, or extent of obedience. But these obviously are mere legal effects of the act, and cannot constitute a difference as to the conscience, except so far as they mark the intention, or mutual purpose respectively of the imposer and taker of the vow. The modern Roman use is clear. Both vows alike, when made under the Church's sanction, place the person in a state and condition of life recognized by the Church, so that vows of poverty, celibacy, and obedience, thus sanctioned, make the person a monk, a friar, a nun. Solemn vows are religious vows approved by the Church with a peculiar sanction. There is no difference in the effect of the vow of obedience, but the solemn vow of celibacy renders the person who has taken it incapable of contracting marriage validly, and in this respect is like Sacred Orders. The marriage of a person who has made a simple vow of Religion is valid, though sacrilegious. A person who has made a simple Religious vow of poverty, retains the ownership of property, but not the right to use it. The solemn vow of poverty is like death, and the person who

but it is rather technical than real. The real difference *in foro conscientiæ*, lies in this—that the vow in either case is uttered only in the sense in which the Church accepts and seals it, being accompanied in the one case with circumstances and a ceremonial involving the most absolute self-surrender, as well as the least possibility of recall; in the other, under circumstances known to be less binding, and with greater facility for dispensation. The mind of the Church, representing the Mind of GOD, is believed to determine the difference of obligation, and so the difference of the vows.

The history of the Religious life in this respect is therefore clear. At first the stability of the act of self-devotion rested simply on the love of CHRIST, and the desire of serving Him without distraction. Afterwards, as Religious Communities increased, the liability was felt of admission being sought with less pure and less enduring motives, and a vow was introduced, but one of the simplest character, its observance depending on the individual conscience. In still later times, the principles of Community life naturally attained more systematic form, and as the necessity was increasingly felt for investing a Religious profession with greater definiteness and security, the formal vows became the established rule. Some have thought that the introduction of vows led to the abuses which have often saddened the later history of Religious Communities. The truth rather is, that the vow was in part employed to remedy and check the tendencies to decay, which spread even into the cloister in times of growing laxity of morals. The age at which such momentous vows were allowed to be taken, may have been premature; but this was an accident, not of the essence, of the vow system. To the faithful Religious, the vow was but the natural expression of the mind's purpose; the risk was in the absence of sufficient safeguards against the possible admission of persons unqualified either by age or disposition to make such engagements. The laws which regulated the testing of postulants may have been at fault, not the promises made to GOD, which the state of life necessarily implied.

It may be well, before proceeding further, to consider the authoritatively accepted meaning of a Religious vow.

A vow is to be distinguished from a purpose, which does not

has taken it, cannot own property or make a will. The Church, in fact, makes vows solemn or simple, when she approves them *as such*. The public state and mode of life exists by her approbation, and she has chosen in what cases she will give the higher or the lower sanction.

bind the conscience, as also from an oath, which is a promise made to man with the interposition of the Name of GOD, as the Witness and Judge. A vow is a promise made to GOD under pain of sin; and a vow of Religion, so called, has for its object some greater and more perfect good, beyond what is necessary for a man's salvation[4]. Jeremy Taylor's more diffuse description is substantially the same; "A vow is an act of prayer, and a great degree and instance of opportunity, and an increase of duty, by some new uncommanded instance, or some more eminent degree of duty, or frequency of action, or earnestness of spirit in the same." Taylor adds as to the reality of such a contract; "It hath pleased GOD in all ages of the world to admit of intercourse with His servants in the matter of vows." In order for a vow to be binding, there is required, according to the Schoolmen, (1) intention, (2) deliberation, (3) freedom of action. Gautrelet adds knowledge of the nature of a vow, of the obligations imposed, and of the subject-matter included. Jeremy Taylor's cautions, beside what he notes in common with the authorities above mentioned, are, "that it be done with prudence, i. e. that it be safe in all the circumstances of the person, lest we beg a blessing, and fall into a snare; (2) that it be accompanied with a new enforcement of some essential and unalterable duty, or that duty be secured before one enlarges in counsels; (3) for young beginners, that they do not straiten liberty by vows of long continuance, or by any without great experience of themselves, and of all accidental dangers[5]."

It is often questioned whether a vow adds any thing to the acceptableness of the act by which the soul gives itself to GOD. The Schoolmen—and Roman divines generally adopt their teaching—answered this question in the affirmative. To vow a thing and do it, was ruled to be more than simply to do it, on the ground that it is not only a giving oneself to GOD as to the present act, but also as to the power of action in future. A favourite illustration is wont to be used in describing the difference. To give the fruit of a tree, is less than to give the tree itself, together with its fruit and fructifying power. This distinction, however, would seem to hold good only in case a freedom of withdrawal from any obligation is left open. It can have no real

[4] The definition of the earlier Schoolmen was thus simply expressed; "Votum est promissio Deo facta de meliori bono." Gautrelet expands this definition with a further explanation:—"Le vœu est une promesse faite à Dieu d'un acte meilleur, c'est à dire, dit S. Antonin, un acte plus parfait que celui auquel on est obligé pour le salut."

[5] *Holy Living and Dying*, Heber's Edit., vol. iv. p. 225.

application in the case of one placing himself in a position which in itself implies an obligation to remain. The outward circumstances, as, e. g. of one consecrated in a Religious Community, whose withdrawal would be deemed a scandal, or be visited with censure, must needs be equally an entire self-surrender, whether, or not, it be accompanied with formal vows. The willingly binding upon oneself any moral pressure, is a practical equivalent for the formal utterance of the lips. On the principle stated, however, it is argued, that vows are of the essence of the Religious life, and constitute its reality. The Schoolmen generally, as well as later Roman Divines, teach that they are "the ordinary means of fixing oneself in the Religious state, because, in order to be a state, properly so called, there must be stability, permanence, which is the effect produced by vows in consequence of the obligation they impose[6]."

The meaning of this statement must be, that the vow is to be considered as synonymous with permanence, or as the only security for it. Otherwise such a position would be to resolve the laws of the inner life into a question of external constraint. To view the obligation as depending on the formal expression of the lips, would be to make it simply external. A state of life must necessarily depend for its permanence, not on its expression, but on the calling of GOD, Whose grace inspires and sustains it. It can only be with the idea of securing a doubtful purpose by moral force, or as regarding the engagement as matter of discipline, that the mere promise can be ruled to be of the essence of the bond. Stability is the result of an inward stedfastness, the fruit of a Divine operation. Vows must be worthless, as a hold upon the conscience, if the life which dictated them has expired. The indelibility of holy Orders, or the indissolubility of marriage, do not depend on the promises made when the obligation of either state is undertaken, whatever be the form or kind of promise, but on the ordinance of GOD instituting such states of life, known in themselves to involve their own special obligations[7].

[6] "Pour qu'il y ait état proprement dit, il faut qu'il y ait stabilité, permanence, et c'est l'effet que produisent les vœux par l'obligation qu'ils imposent."—Gautrelet, *L'État Religieux*, vol. i. p. 94.

[7] The question has been asked, how far the late change in the subscription required of Priests in the Church of England, affects those who have bound themselves by the old form. The answer is clear. The precise words in which the promise is made, is not the ground or essential condition of the obligation, and therefore cannot affect it. The obligation is incurred on the understood ground of belief in, and use of, certain formularies, to which the Priest is committed by his ordination vows. If the formularies themselves were altered in their material substance, the obligation would necessarily be affected by such change; it would altogether cease.

The state of Religion is not indeed a sacrament ordained of GOD; but it is of a kindred order of life within the sphere of supernatural grace, founded on a definite and express call, by which the HOLY GHOST makes known His will, and necessarily involving certain obligations. It is as much the SPIRIT'S witness to the soul, as being the ordained means of its perfection, as the sacramental ordinances referred to are institutions of GOD through the Same SPIRIT. That there is a natural desire in the soul to give utterance to its resolves—that such outward expression is in harmony with the Church's ordinary use in forming rites for the consecration of persons to states of life within its sphere—that it is a stay to the soul's consciousness of its own acts of devotion; a protection cast about the person, cutting off the possibility of change in the sight of others—and a fitting assurance to a Community of the fixed purpose of its professed members—these are positions which can hardly be disputed, any more than that vows are lawful, and, if according to His will, pleasing and acceptable to GOD. But it is equally certain that, if the history of the Church, when its first love was quickened by the freshest out-pouring of the SPIRIT, is to be taken as an evidence of her mind, and of the Mind of her GOD, sealed by the Church's witness, a tacit profession is as real an evidence of the truth of the Divine vocation, and the inner life itself the only sure ground of stability, and alone essential to its acceptance in the sight of GOD.

It is sometimes urged that a continual self-devotion, ever renewed by ever-repeated acts, while the soul is still free to withdraw, is a more generous and self-denying sacrifice, than an act which allows no recall, which is done once and for ever. There is no doubt a seeming attractiveness in the thought; but it is difficult to understand what is meant. In regard to a material offering, external to oneself, such a course would be simply impossible. We cannot give, while yet we retain. To retain the power of continually giving, we must be really still holding it in our possession. We have not given it, from the very fact that we still have the power of giving it. Can there be a difference in the case of giving oneself? If we continually offer ourselves, we have at all times the power of withdrawing the offering; and this very freedom, which is supposed to be deliberately retained, really makes it to be no gift. While it is still in our power, it is still our own. We may give, or not give, the very next hour. It is not that the vow constitutes the gift, but the conscious acceptance of the call of GOD necessarily, if it be true, involves the future equally as the present. It is of GOD, and partakes of His eternity. There ought, indeed, to be the utmost caution, fore-

thought, deliberation, embracing both inward dispositions and outward duties, a spirit of self-distrust and fear, in lowliest dependence on the leadings of grace and the providence of GOD. And all this, moreover, accompanied with such assistance as can be attained through the guidance of those to whom the care of the soul is rightfully entrusted. But these considerations, though they greatly affect the wisdom and rectitude of the decision, are but conditions of its character, not the constituent elements of its life. It is the following of JESUS, and the being united with His life in the form which He wills to impress on the soul, which constitutes its reality; and to leave any reserve of self-choosing in the future, is but to "keep back part of the price."

The case of temporary vows is a distinct question. There are, of course, a great many cases, like that of the "Nazarite of days" in Israel, according to which, for temporary purposes, obligations may be voluntarily undertaken, which wholly cease when the object is fulfilled. One may, for any reason, be bound for a certain term of years to the rules of a Religious Community, with the intention of withdrawing, or, through scrupulous lowliness, taking what seems the safer course, or in order to consider more fully the question of a more permanent bond. But such a case cannot be regarded as a clear call of GOD determining the life, or a state of grace fixing a certain character on the soul; and this alone has been assumed to be the basis on which vows of Religion rest. Vows are measured by the purpose which they express, and a mere temporary object is not a state of life. The case is essentially different, if temporary vows are taken only because outward circumstances prevent the full expression of the resolved will, or the laws of the Church refuse to recognize a more permanent consecration, while yet to the conscience itself the act of dedication is final and complete. Such is the case of some of the great foreign Communities, where, as among the Sisters of Charity, temporary vows only are permitted, renewable at fixed periods; or in the Order of Jesuits, among whom the final and irrevocable vow is taken only after a prolonged probation, during which temporary vows have been made[8]. Temporary vows arising from such a cause are in their essence as complete as a life-long vow.

[8] Gautrelet gives much interesting information as to the action of the civil power upon Religious Communities in France. In regard to the Sœurs Hospitalières, it was decreed in 1809, that novices of twenty-one years of age could only bind themselves by vow for a period of five years. The law of May 24, 1815, extended the same rule to all Religious Communities (vol. i. p. 102). He also says, that as a consequence of this law, no Religious Communities in France are more than Congregations; none of them Orders (*pro-*

They implicitly embrace the future with the present. The reasons which determine the temporary nature of the vow, not the fact of its limited periodicity, attach to the act its real character.

Allusion has been made, in the course of these remarks, to the power of dispensing vows. It seemed better not to interrupt the course of the argument by a partial reference to this important feature of the system, which involves so many considerations, and has so vital a bearing on the whole subject, that it cannot be satisfactorily discussed without a separate treatment.

There is no instance of a dispensation, nor any direct authority for the exercise of such a power, in either the Old or New Testament. It may also be urged that, had such a power existed, it would have been exercised in such a case as Jephthah's vow, or that at least some allusion to its possibility might be expected to have occurred in the narrative. On the other hand, it may as justly be said, that the usage of Holy Scripture is to enunciate the laws of the Divine life, not the exceptions to them, the Church being entrusted with the charge of adapting them to the necessities of individual character, or the exigencies of social and domestic claims. Moreover if, as already observed, only two cases of life-vows are recorded in the Old Testament, and yet these can hardly be regarded as solitary instances, the same silence may have been observed as to dispensations, and yet such a power may have existed. The Jewish priests of later days exercised this power, at least in the case of rash vows. Lightfoot alludes to the custom, when commenting on the case of the men who had bound themselves "not to eat, or drink till they had killed Paul[9]."

prement dits), because only simple vows are permitted to be taken. Even the Carmelites, and Nuns of the Visitation, though formerly recognized as Orders, and still such in other countries, are only Congregations in France. Their vows have no legal perpetuity. The legal view is of course (p. 137) distinct from the ecclesiastical, but the practical carrying out of the one necessarily affects the other.

[9] "What will become of these anathematized persons, if their curse should be upon them, and they cannot reach to murder Paul (as indeed it happened they could not)? Must not these wretches helplessly die with hunger? Alas! they need not be very solicitous about that matter, they have their Casuistic Rabbins, that can easily release them of their vow." He quotes the following passage as his authority,—"He that hath made a vow not to eat any thing, woe to him if he eat, and woe to him if he do not eat. If he eat, he sinneth against his vow, and if he do not eat, he sinneth against his life. What must such a man do in this sense? Let him go to the wise men, and they will loose his vow, according as it is written, 'the tongue of the wise is health'" (Prov. xii. 18). *Horæ Hebraicæ, et Talmudicæ*, Acts xxvii. 12.

If a dispensing power was exercised in the case of rash vows, it might also probably be extended to cases in which either change of circumstances, or a defect of capacity, had rendered a release from the obligation consistent with the Divine mercy. It is material, moreover, to note that vows in certain specified cases might, by the Mosaic law, be redeemed. The power of redemption was ordained at the same time that the use of vows was regulated. Thus, e. g., a house or land devoted to the LORD might be redeemed at a certain price, to be computed by the priest. (Lev. xxvii. 14.) In case of redemption of the person, if he happened to be a poor man, there was a merciful provision for remitting part of the price; "according to his ability that vowed, shall the priest value him" (v. 8). This careful adaptation to individual needs suggests the idea of a purpose in the mind of GOD to allow special grounds of exemption from the extreme stringency of obligations, which yet as a general law were unquestionably binding.

In the early Church, as in the early days of the Mosaic Covenant, there is no instance of the exercise of any dispensing power. The evidence against its existence is of the strongest possible kind. In Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, a work which enters into so many minute details of their history, there is no mention of the possibility of obtaining a dispensation. But the history does not extend beyond A.D. 640; and during this period only the simple Benedictine vow was as yet in use, and the laws of the Religious life were not fully systematized. An accumulation of unquestionable evidence, however, extends the same conclusion far into the middle ages, making it clear, that the practice was but slowly admitted, being exercised only in the rarest cases up to the 16th century[1]. It is to be noted, however, that from the beginning, as facts already alluded to

[1] I am indebted to Mr. John David Chambers, Recorder of Old Sarum, for kindly communicating to me the result of his extensive researches. He thus writes:—"In the learned Commentary by Martine, on the Benedictine rule, no such possibility (viz. of dispensation) is even alluded to. In the same Commentator's voluminous book, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, there is not a hint on the subject, although it contains a vast variety of forms and rites relating to monastic discipline. The books specially relating to England (Bede's *History* and *Works*, Gildas, and Nennius, Eddius, Gale's *Septem Scriptores*, Canisius' *Antiquæ Lectiones*, the lives of S. Columba, S. Wilfrid, &c.), and (as far as I have read them) the old English historians, Colgani *Acta Sanctorum*, *Penitential Acts and Constitutions*, and Flemying's *Collectanea* as to Ireland, have not one word on the subject, and never hint at such a thing taking place. Fosbrooke's *British Monachism* is the last book published in England on the subject, and contains a summary of the

sufficiently prove, penance was allowed to those who, having been consecrated, abandoned their profession. After fulfilment of certain penitential acts, they were restored; even marriage being then recognized as lawful. This practice in itself virtually implies a dispensing power. It remitted the sin of a breach of vow, clearing the soul, and setting it free. It is practically the same thing to dispense a vow, or to remit the sin incurred by its breach.

To dispense, it must be carefully noted, is not a mere judgment to decide whether a vow be binding or not. There may have been ignorance of the circumstances, or of some vital condition involved in the act, or the state of things contemplated may have ceased to exist or be so changed as essentially to affect the object in view. In these and other like cases, to judge is simply to interpret the law, and free one already freed. Such questions belong to the simple grace of a wise counsel, which a layman might exercise. To dispense, in the proper sense of the term, is a special attribute of the priesthood. There is also a material difference to be observed between dispensing and commuting a vow. To commute is to sanction the transference of the obligation from one subject-matter to another, of equal, or greater, acceptableness; a process which though requiring the most cautious consideration, yet in itself implies the rendering to GOD an equivalent, or it may be more than equivalent, for what had been promised. A commutation is, in fact, identical with the redemption allowed in the Levitical law.

The power of dispensation is traced by the Schoolmen and all later Divines to the Sacerdotal Commission. The words, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven [2]," are unlimited in their application, and are therefore understood as

rules of the different Orders. But there is not a word about the dispensation of vows. Lyndwood's *Provinciale* is the law-book which contains a summary of the laws as to monachism in this country. In it those who leave their monasteries, or do not perform their vows, are called apostates, renegades, &c., and threatened with severest penalties, and various modes of punishing them are pointed out. There is not a word or hint in the whole book of any possibility of relaxing from their vows those who had once solemnly taken them." Mr. Chambers also refers to Thorpe's *Laws and Institutes of England*, which includes Theodore's *Penitential Constitutions* and Egberith of York's ditto. "They contain various denunciations against apostate monks, &c."

[2] S. Matt. xvi. 19. "Dominus concessit ecclesiæ potestatem solvendi a vinculo culpæ et pœnæ; ergo etiam e vinculo voti et abjuramenti, cum id pariter expediat saluti animarum et suavi Ecclesiæ regimini."—Billuart's *Summa T. A.*, vol. viii. p. 282.

including every bond which a man may contract towards GOD, and a release from which may be believed to be according to His will. (*"Auctoritas Prelati in personâ Dei determinat quid sit ipsi acceptum"*). A vital distinction, however, must be carefully observed between what GOD Himself has decreed, and what the soul has of its own free choice laid upon itself. Obligations of the former kind, such e. g. as the contract of marriage, or a subject's duty towards his rulers, do not fall under our consideration. They are in their own nature absolutely binding. No earthly power can dispense what is obligatory simply by the Divine law. Neither are such obligations the subject-matter of vows, such as we are now considering, which, both in substance and measure, are left to the soul's free choice in things not necessary to salvation. Such covenants imply the possibility of error from the fallibility of the person covenanting, and the unavoidable liability to fail in providing for all circumstances involved, which yet need to be taken into account. The dispenser does not act as one assuming power either over the conscience, or the Divine laws. He does not profess to disannul an existing bond, or to make void a claim which GOD has upon the soul. He intervenes only in the case of one's own or another's error, to relieve the soul from the burden and guilt of an obligation which an indiscreet zeal, or events unprovided for, may render harder than it can bear. It meets the case of human infirmity and necessities, which might otherwise leave the soul bound in conscience, while yet the possibility of fulfilling its obligations had ceased[3]. It is the merciful provision for exceptional cases which, in the uncertainty of human things, can never fail to beset the action of general laws.

A dispensation always assumes some necessity, and the measure of the necessity limits the extent of the dispensation. Thus, the member of a Community might be released from the vow of poverty, or of obedience, and yet remain bound by the vow of celibacy. So, again, the conscious need and desire of release on the part of the devoted person is presupposed, and, in the case of a third party being interested, their consent also. Thus profession in a Religious Community implies a mutual contract, and consequently the consent of the Community through its Superiors is required for the validity of a dispensation. A dispensation is, therefore, an exercise of mercy within the covenant of grace, to provide for possible contingencies where the soul, powerless to

[3] "Cum prælatus Ecclesiæ dispensat in voto, non dispensat in precepto juris naturalis et divini, sed determinat id quod cadebat sub obligatione deliberationis humanæ quæ non potuit omnia circumspicere."—Billuart's *Summa S. T. A.*

fulfil its own self-imposed obligations, would, but for such a provision, remain hopelessly oppressed by a burden of conscious guilt. The interposition of one commissioned to judge in the Name of GOD, decides what under the circumstances may be believed to be consistent with the Divine compassion. Like the grace of absolution in the case of actual sin, it frees the soul from a bond which it is unable to discharge, and authoritatively seals its exemption from the consequences of its own, or it may be another's, error[4].

It is obvious that the absolving grace thus explained has no necessary connexion with the power supposed to have been claimed by the Papal See, of cancelling obligations at will, and discharging the conscience from the obedience due to positive laws. Bishop Sanderson, in his valuable and elaborate treatise on the *Obligations of Oaths*, while denying the dispensability of a vow, denies it only in this sense. It is the power of dispensing from vows and oaths, in like manner, according to his illustration, as a secular sovereign may dispense a subject from his obligation to the laws of the land, or, as he otherwise states it, the assumption of a Divine power of judgment *in foro interno*, an exercise of dominion within the conscience—which the Bishop so forcibly and so justly controverts[5]. Roman theologians are divided as to the exercise of such a power in the Papal See. It appears at most to be an opinion of certain Jurists, acted upon indeed by certain Popes, but which has not the character of a canon law or article of faith. Billuart, in his treatise on the *Summa S. T. A.*, contrasting the various opinions of Roman divines on the point, brings forward some of highest note as strongly opposed to the

[4] Ecclesia non habet quidem jurisdictionem ut præcipiat aut prohibeat coactive præsertim actus mere internos. Nihil obstat tamen quin habeat jurisdictionem gratiosam apponendi scilicet certas conditiones actibus internis in favorem subditorum, non ut ligentur, set ut liberi maneant (vol. vii.). Billuart's *S. T. A.* The same principle which enables the Church to make conditions as to the extent of the vow imposed, enables it also to judge of the conditions under which a vow is to be relaxed or dispensed.

[5] Sanderson's *De Juramenti Promissorii Obligatione Prælectiones Septem*, Habitæ in Scholâ Theologicâ Oxonii, A.D. 1646. Quam autem potestatem habent Principes seculares dispensandi in legibus suis, eandem sibi arrogant Pontifices Romani dispensandi in votis et juramentis. Obligatio juramenti est intus in conscientiâ, quæ uni Deo subest ut judici, et in quam homo non habet imperium. Quisquis ergo vindicat sibi jus dispensandi in sacramento, assumit sibi potestatem divinam erigendo sibi tribunal in foro interno, et exercendo dominium in hominum conscientias. Et est ipse dispensatio invalida, et de jure nulla, sicut sententia probata a judice in foro non suo, quia prolata est a non judice, est ad omnem juris effectum invalida. —*Prælec. Sept.*, sec. iii.

supposed claim, and shows that the instances quoted of dispensations from Religious vows in the middle ages for purposes of temporal expedience, as of nuns or monks allowed to marry in order to preserve a succession on the throne, are contradicted by others, the facts asserted being rejected by them as of no sufficient authority [6].

S. Thomas Aquinas even denies the Pope's power in dispensing solemn vows. This question was much disputed for many ages, and great names were ranged on either side. Billuart enumerates S. Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, Sylvester, Sotus, and Sylvius, as denying; Cajetan, S. Antonine, Scotus, and Durandus, as affirming it. The affirmative side, however, has finally prevailed, and Roman authorities now universally assert the power of dispensing solemn vows as part of the prerogative of the Papacy, though always, as already observed, viewing it as most exceptional in its use. Both Gaume and Gautrelet state it to be, without question, a privilege residing in the Pope, though to be exercised only in cases *extrèmement rares*[7].

As the dispensing power is a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, there seems no ground in principle, why solemn vows should not be dispensable equally as simple vows. The conditions which constitute the solemnity, so called, of Religious vows, and cause the difference, are determined by the Church. Its power of relaxing them must be involved in its power of constituting them. The reservation to the Papal See can only be

[6] Thus, e. g., the case of Constantia, daughter of Roger, King of Sicily, a nun, said to have been dispensed, in order to marry the Emperor Henry VI.; that of Nicolas Justinian, of Venice, a Benedictine monk, dispensed in order to marry, with the hope of preserving the family which had become extinct during the war with the Turks; and also that of Casimir, king of Poland, once a monk of Clunium, and of Ramira, king of Aragon, previously a Benedictine monk,—are all disputed, and disclaimed in the answer to objections to the question (Art. ix.), "Utrum in votis solemnibus ecclesia seu summus Pontifex posset dispensare?"

[7] Vol. i., p. 106, 107. The grounds on which a dispensation is warranted, according to the Schoolmen, are thus enumerated in Billuart's *Summa*. "Generatim sunt bona Dei et utilitas ecclesiæ, sub quibus aliæ continentur, nimirum bonum communitatis, utilitas voventis, magna ejus fragilitas ex quâ timetur frequens violatio voti, necessitas urgens, minor ætas, metus, inconsideratio, perturbatio mentis in vovendo, et maxime quando tales circumstantiæ occurrunt ut dubium sit an votum subsistat aut obliget. Porro quo majus et excellentius est votum, eo major requiritur ratio, minor si votum sit de re minori, ita ut causa proportionetur voto. Et ubi causa non apparet omnino sufficiens, commutandum est votum in aliud opus pium. Imo etsi sit sufficiens, tamen ad majorem securitatem raro utendum est purâ dispensatione absque aliquâ commutatione, sicque solent SS. Pontifices."—Dissert. iv. Art. viii. sec. 4. sub fin.

supposed to express the Church's sense of the necessity of rendering such dispensations extremely difficult[8].

It is of importance to note Gautrelet's statements of the present condition of Community life in respect to vows in the Congregations of France, which, as already stated, in the present day include all its Religious Communities. He states that their vows impose obligations only in accordance with the rule and intentions of the Superior, involving no further responsibility; that the Superior only professes to receive vows according to the rule; that only in the same sense the Church approves them; that if more be added, it is not to be regarded as a vow of Religion, but a strictly private vow as to all that exceeds the sense determined by the rule, the vow of an inferior unsanctioned by his superior[9]. He further remarks, that a Religious who has received a valid dispensation, is freed from all obligation (*délivré de toute obligation*), and that even if the Community has been left without one, it may be afterwards obtained through penance. A dismissal in itself involves a dispensation. A different law obtains as to solemn vows, which are still binding after a dismissal, and require a direct dispensation. The vow of celibacy, whether simple or solemn, is treated as a special case. The reason seems evident. It is the expression of an inner state of devotion, more personally binding than the comparatively external bond of poverty or obedience[1].

[8] It is curious to note the subjects of devotion which the Western Church has judged to be reserved for this most difficult and rarest exercise of the grace of dispensation. The Schoolmen counted two only under this category, the vow of perpetual celibacy, and that of the pilgrimage to the Holy Land . . . Later canonists have extended this reservation to three other cases, viz. the vow of entering the Religious state, and of making the pilgrimages to the shrine of S. James of Compostella, and to that of S. Peter and S. Paul. For the statements made as to the opinion of the Schoolmen, see Billuart, *Sum. Sancti Thom.*, Dissert. iv., *De Voto*, Art. v.—ix. passim. Gautrelet gives interesting details of the mode of treatment adopted in the case of the sad disturbance of the Religious Orders, occasioned by the French Revolution, A.D. 1792. Pius VII. authorized the Bishops of France to allow all Religious to change their Order, or to commute their engagements altogether to other pious exercises, in case of its being necessary for them to return to the world, even the vow of celibacy not being excepted (vol. ii. p. 129).

[9] Gautrelet, vol. i. p. 102.

[1] Gautrelet thus describes the feeling as to this particular, of nuns at the present day in the Religious Communities of France. "Ce qui paraît certain, c'est que plusieurs ne s'engageraient point à garder la chasteté dans le monde, si elles pensaient devoir y rentrer, et que plusieurs au contraire étendraient l'obligation qu'elles s'imposent au cas même où elles prévoiraient devoir sortir de religion; ce qui paraît encore certain, c'est que la plupart, si ce n'est toutes, regardent ses engagements comme perpetuels, font l'abstraction de la circonstance où elles sortiraient de la congrégation, et ont l'intention, au moins im-

It thus appears, that in the present condition of Community life in France, the obligations of Religious, independently of their own conscientious sense of the call of GOD to the soul, rest on the contract with the Community, or the Church impersonated in the Community, the claims of the individual conscience being measured by the outward organization in obedience to the rule of the Church.

Before bringing these remarks to a close, it seems necessary to consider a question of practical moment to ourselves, which the conclusions gathered from Holy Scripture, and the past history of the Church, may enable us to solve. How far is it expedient to introduce vows into the Religious Communities now increasingly being formed among ourselves, as a formal and integral part of the system? The considerations raised are not merely such as attend the simple taking of vows. Private vows involve far less important consequences. They do not affect others, as well as those who take them, or not to the same extent. They do not commit the Church. There is ordinarily less danger of imperfect motives operating, or at least less temptation to enter into them. The mere desire to enter a Religious Community, and the effect of temporary excitement, may possibly influence in the one case to undertake a risk, which might not be ventured without such inducements. There is, moreover, the question of contract, by which both parties, the individual and the Community, are mutually bound. Thus, while private vows are ordinarily but simple questions of discretion for the individual, or between the individual and his spiritual director, on the other hand a complication of circumstances surrounds a Community vow, which brings the inquiry into collision with some of the gravest and most critical questions that can affect the Church's life, as well as the good of Communities themselves.

It is important to observe that it is a question not of necessity, but of expedience. It can hardly be too strongly affirmed, that to identify vows with the necessary integrity or security of the Religious life, is entirely to ignore its earlier history, to disparage the first callings of the SPIRIT in His Pentecostal fulness, and to deny the all-sufficiency of the grace which alone constitutes their power. So far as such an idea extends, it substitutes in the place of a living creation of GOD the creature's own vocal act and outward covenant.

plicite, en faisant les vœux de se lier pour toujours. Il faudrait donc regarder le vœu de chasteté comme perpetuel, ou surtout qu'on peut l'observer dans le monde (vol. ii. p. 137).

On the other hand, to deny the lawfulness or moral expedience of vows, as though it were to presume unduly on the stability of the soul's purpose, and to bind what ought not to be bound, because either the soul is too weak to commit itself for the future, or forfeits an independence necessary to its own moral truth in its dependence on the possible contingencies and calls of the Providence of GOD—would be to lose sight altogether of the very principle of special Divine vocations, and to cast distrust on the power of GOD to sustain the life in which He has predestined His own elect to serve Him. There may, of course, be error in ascertaining the fact of a vocation. What is simply of human predilection, or superficial ardour, of mere flesh and blood, may be interpreted to mean a miracle of special grace. The workings of the HOLY GHOST may be misread. To use all diligence to guard against mistakes in so vital a matter, is the moral which the long history of Conventual institutions has stamped with unmistakeable clearness on the Church's experience. But it strikes at the very root of the principle of Divine vocations, to question their enduring power, or to suppose that the providences of GOD can be in conflict with His secret inspirations. His inward operations of grace are as truly His eternal Will, as His guidings of outward events. To interpret them aright may not be given to all. To deny their permanence, where they are truly ascertained, is to separate the life of the members of His mystical Body from its enduring source in His Incarnation. To say that the soul may not in such case cast itself on its preternatural destiny, and bind about itself the treasured tokens of a covenant of love, given and received, believing in the certainty of its acceptance and assurance of support, as certain as of any wedded human love, feeling the true stay of a like consecrated bond of union,—is to forget the promise of the SPIRIT Who divideth "to every man severally as He will," and the power of His Voice Who called into being new worlds of life, when He said, in announcing the special forms of a wholly devoted life; "He that will receive it, let him receive it."

At the same time there is great reason for supposing that in refounding Religious Houses, which, through the love of our good LORD towards us, is become, perhaps, the most momentous work of our own eventful days,—when so much has necessarily to be learnt, so much practical experience to be gained, so many conspiring claims to be adjusted, and, as the witness of long past ages teaches, so many possibilities of error to be avoided—great caution must be needed, at least in this early stage of their existence, as to the general introduction of vows as a formal part of the bonds of Community life. It is much to be con-

sidered, that vows were a later development, not an initiatory step, in the organization of Communities of Religious, and that a graduated system of dispensations became a necessity after their introduction. Not that these facts form any argument against vows. They only mark the progressive order which such forms of life tend to assume. They show the natural working of the inner desires of the soul, seeking to bring the outward organization of its state into the most decisive correspondence with its own self-devotion. And such we can hardly doubt was one great cause of the addition of these formal bonds, and of the complex ceremonial gradually clothing them, in order the more to symbolize the entire consecration to GOD. Nor can it be reasonably questioned, but that the abuses commonly believed to have arisen through the more rigid systematizing of Conventual life, are due rather to other incidental features —such as the early age of admission, and the impossibility of testing at such a period of life the true tendencies of the character—than to the act or utterance of the self-devotion itself. But such considerations clearly teach the need of progressive and cautious advance in the formation of a system which, from the very greatness of its power, involves such momentous possibilities of good and evil, and which, in order to attain a healthful growth, needs, like the kindred forms of social and domestic relations, to develope in harmony with the growth of inner life and spiritual experience.

Whether or not formal life-vows are generally advisable for the completeness of our Religious Communities, is a matter of grave and anxious question. That they are a part of the free and legitimate claim of those who, surrendering earthly ties, aspire to form ties of heavenly love, and ask for significant tokens and bonds in the one case, such as the usage of the Church has always sanctioned in the other, can hardly be surrendered by those who value and seek to advance the interests of such Institutions. They are what devoted persons naturally desire, and with urgency, it may be, proportioned to their zeal. But the fact that the general feeling amongst us is against such a use; that the Church may be expected to be slow in giving any canonical sanction to it; and especially that the civil power is not likely to recognize what the laws even of Roman Catholic countries, of which France is a signal instance, tend more and more to disallow, while yet the action of Civil Courts must materially affect the question in its possible ultimate appeals, because the rights of persons and of property are so largely mixed up with the guarantees and securities of Religious institutions, and their

members—such considerations must enter into the question, and need, together with their various consequences, to be very carefully taken into account. Such arguments, however, cannot apply to the use of vows as an expression of individual desire, and love, on the part of any one, whether a member of a Religious Community or not, if they be sought after repeated testings, as the final sealing of the profession of a long assured purpose. Such cases are a law to themselves.

But whatever may be judged to be most advisable as to the use of life-vows in our Religious Communities, it is a striking and assuring circumstance, that even the popular feeling is in favour of the very result which life-vows seek to ensure. It is an instance of a true instinct supplying the lack of an ecclesiastical law. The mere idea of one in any way fully sealed to the profession of a devoted life, returning to the world, of a Sister marrying or mixing again in ordinary society, is as repugnant to the natural conscience, as though it were the breach of a formal vow. It would be felt to be a scandal, even though not visited with public penance. The consciousness of a Divine calling needs not the artificial strength of law, to cast around it any outward stay to assure its own permanence.

It must, moreover, be borne in mind, that the introduction of formal vows into Religious Communities would, according to the universal experience of the Western Church, necessitate the careful adjustment of a dispensing power. Such a power need not extend beyond the vows which bind the professed to the Community. The inner devotion of the individual life might remain untouched by it, the soul still being left to render its own account of its personal devotion to her LORD. The professed has a two-fold relation, one towards the Community, the other towards GOD. They are intimately intermingled, and practically coalesce; but the one might be dissolved by dispensing the vow of obedience, while the other might remain equally true and undisturbed by the preservation of the vow of celibacy[2]. But the member of a Religious Community could not rightly dissolve his own connexion with the Community, nor, conversely, the Community of itself alone sever the bond that binds the professed member to itself. The intervention of a spiritual authority would be required to give a Divine sanction to a rupture which involves spiritual, not merely social, consequences.

[2] A dismissal from a Religious Community is understood, according to Roman use, to involve, *ipso facto*, the dispensing of simple vows, or at least to form an adequate ground for claiming it; in the case of solemn vows it is different, as before observed.

It is sometimes urged, that a dispensing power cannot exist without a formal sanction of the Church, or at least of some central authority, like the Papal, formally recognized by the Church. But if the position be true, that the priestly commission embraces the power of dispensing vows, i. e. of relieving from guilt or spiritual disability the dissolution of the spiritual tie at the desire of the person devoted, or when become incapable of fulfilling the obligation which had been erroneously incurred, then it follows that such power is inherent in the priesthood. But the exercise of this power, though properly inherent in the priesthood, has ever been wont to be limited by the law of the Church; and it is most important to note that, according to the use of Western Christendom, the power of dispensation has been strictly confined to the Episcopate, or those possessed of Episcopal authority. It has been always considered a part of the *forum externum*, a matter of jurisdiction, not of order, and only when delegated by a bishop, within the province of the priest[3]. No doubt such a restriction is matter of discipline, as the ground of the power is laid in the sacerdotal commission. But the moral reasons which determine the advisableness of vesting such a power in an authority removed as far back as possible beyond the immediate direction of the Community, as, according to Roman use, in reserved cases of confession, are manifest. A bishop may sometimes act as both Ordinary and spiritual director of a Community, when the grace and moral circumstances of the Episcopate are trusted to, as a sufficient guard against the interference of the one responsibility with that of the other. But as a general rule, it would manifestly appear to be expedient, wherever possible, in regard to Communities which imply both spiritual and social relations, to place the dispensing power in other hands than those which are immediately concerned with the constant government of the Society.

It is time for these remarks to be brought to a close. The great importance of the subject will, it is hoped, excuse a length of treatment which, in a mixed publication like a volume of Essays on Questions of the day, would otherwise hardly be warranted. The questions involved touch the most delicate as well as the most powerful agencies of the Divine life within the elect soul. They have also a most momentous bearing on the ultimate destination of Communities to which, if rightly directed, we may look, under GOD, for the most important benefits to the

[3] According to Roman use, Provincials and the Generals of certain Orders, &c., having power of dispensation, exercise it only as part of the Episcopal authority entrusted to them. Billuart, Dissert. iv. Art. viii. § 4.

efficiency of the Church of England in elevating the tone of religion amongst us, and meeting the wants of the enormous multitudes rapidly growing up within her borders. That in this and all the complicated questions connected with it, it may please GOD to guide, in His wisdom and love, those who are concerned with the formation or government of such Societies, and to secure to the Societies themselves all that is needful for establishing and perfecting their life according to its highest standard, calls for the earnest and constant prayer of all who feel at heart the true interests of the Church, the good of souls, and the glory of our ever Blessed LORD and SAVIOUR.

T. THELLUSSON CARTER.

P.S.—The following facts have been kindly communicated by an Ecclesiastic of high distinction and authority in the Russian Church, in answer to questions put by the writer of the Essay, as to the belief and practice now prevailing in regard to Vows in the Eastern portion of the Catholic Church:—

1. Religious Vows, according to ancient custom, equally for men and women, were always regarded as perpetual.

2. About twenty years ago an Order of "Sisters of Charity" was founded in Russia by some pious individuals. The vows taken by them are *simple* ones, and limited from one to five years.

3. *Solemn vows* are in the form of oaths, calling GOD to witness the sincerity of the resolution taken by the postulant; while *simple vows* are pronounced in the presence of the Chaplain and of the Superior of the Convent, without being accompanied by any religious ceremony.

4. According to old established rule, the term of noviciate is three years for the Contemplative Orders (similar to that of the Carmelites), and the only one existing in Russia, with the exception of that of the Sisters of Charity; but the Superior has the power of shortening this period, if assured of the qualities possessed by the novice. Sisters of Charity take their vows after a noviciate of a month or six weeks.

5. Vows of both these kinds are recognized by the State.

6. Dispensation from vows can be obtained through an Archbishop, on application by him to the Holy Synod. It has often been granted in extraordinary cases. Many monks and nuns, having been freed from their vows, have subsequently married.

7. Those whose vows of obedience and poverty have been cancelled, are equally exempted from those of celibacy.

8. The Religious life of monks is considered as forming a more perfect state, on account of the example of people detaching themselves from the things of this world, of privations, &c.

9. There is no secret dispensation from vows; every thing is done publicly, and the individual whose vows have been cancelled, becomes an ordinary member of society. There is often a feeling of prejudice against him at first among the public; but it rapidly wears off, unless his future mode of living is reprehensible, and justifies these feelings of antipathy.

The Study of Foreign Gothic Architecture, and its Influence on English Art.

Among the many evidences of our English narrowness of mind, few are more noteworthy by artists than those which affect the study of continental architecture; and the fact that they present themselves not unfrequently in the writings of men of undoubted influence and mark, makes it necessary to examine carefully how far they can be justifiably withstood; and thus, by the way, how far our national form of architecture is paramount in its claims on our study, as well as upon our love.

The writer of this paper wishes to treat this subject as dispassionately as possible, not only because he has from time to time been himself attacked—and sometimes warmly—for his earnest study of foreign architecture, but because there is no question that the proper direction of the studies of young architectural students is a subject of the utmost importance at the present moment. It is impossible for any one to predict with any assurance, how far the present zeal for the study of our mediæval antiquities will be lasting. In the very nature of things, it is unlikely that the same kind of inducements will always exist for the study of local antiquities, or the support of local architectural societies. The antiquities of entire districts may become, so to speak, exhausted by the publications, and essays, and notices of them, which these societies have encouraged or produced; and so, the more active minds of the next generation may not have the same incentives to study, which have been so fruitful of results in our own time. And hence, without for an instant doubting that the love of Christian architecture which never entirely died out in this land, is less than ever likely to do so now, and doubting still less that the English Church will never again fall back into that lethargy, the awakening from which synchronized necessarily with the architectural revival, it does seem to be the bounden duty of architects to study how far, in the practice of their art, they may place it on so firm and secure an artistic basis as shall enable it to hold its own undisturbed, even if deserted in some degree by the enthusiasm to which it has hitherto so largely been indebted.

Most thoughtful artists will probably agree in believing that

as there has never been but one absolutely nationalized and definite form of pure art in this country, so there is only one form, from the earnest study of which, any great national artist can be formed. It is idle to talk in the glib way so common, unfortunately, in the so-called professional papers of the day about the invention off-hand of a new style. Such deliberate invention in art is—unless the whole history of art is wrong—absolutely impossible; and those who really study their art will agree unanimously that those who talk in this way are, with rare—if any—exceptions, men whose works prove that they have never themselves studied, save in a superficial fashion, and who long, therefore, for some royal and rapid way of ascent among their compeers, which, despite their longings, will never be accorded to any who have not, in addition to the natural foundation of artistic fire and genius, that solid acquaintance with the history and developments of their art which are to an architect —just what all his painfully acquired technical knowledge is to the painter—the first indispensable conditions of any success in his work.

Those who doubt the advantage of the study of Foreign Art can only do so on one of two grounds. Either our own ancient art is the best in the world, and therefore study of any other is unnecessary; or, granting its occasional inferiority, it is still our own, and any leavening of other influences with it will of necessity destroy its individuality, and so, its preciousness in English eyes. Of these two grounds the first is probably seldom taken; but the second—illogical as it appears to be—has nevertheless so much of tender and true sentiment for its basis, that one ought to be very cautious how one denounces it. And the object of this paper will be to show how far, without injury to this sentiment, it may be in our power, as it certainly is our duty, to do our best to develope by degrees beyond the point to which our own forefathers reached, and to some extent by means of those foreign examples which, even to those who doubt their influence on us, are so interesting and often so imposing in their character.

It requires but few words to explain why no one can ever rightly understand English Art without knowing a great deal also about Continental Art. We have absolutely no early art in this country which was indigenous; all has been imported from the South, and the original of every thing that we have is to be found in Romanesque and Byzantine buildings, developed by degrees from Roman and Greek originals. The history of the art of northern nations is almost entirely the story of a gradual changing, and generally deterioration of detail, from the first

example until the often-diluted copy becomes only dimly recognizable. Take, for instance, a fully developed thirteenth century sculptured capital, and place it by the side of an early Romanesque capital, from Italy or the south of France, and it will be difficult at first to realize the truth, that the one is a natural growth out of the other. Still better is it to take some Romanesque enrichment here, and to compare it with the original from which it derives. Usually it will be found that the copy is inferior in delicacy, in true vigour of line and purpose, and in general beauty, to the original; though at the same time this copy may become the *point de départ* for work which, ceasing to be copy, and only deriving naturally from the original, has all the characteristics and beauties of original work. It is in this way that our own peculiar variety of first-pointed, or early English, architecture has been arrived at. Canterbury Cathedral was as little English in its original style as any building on English soil could well be; yet the modifications in its character commenced with the death of the first architect, and there, as elsewhere, gradual alterations of apparently minor kinds, and such as were not suspected to be likely to affect the whole course of art, crept in, and did really give the origin to all that we call especially English in mediæval art.

There is one feature of which, more than of any other, this is true, and this is the planning of the abaci of the capitals. The Romanesque architects almost invariably made the abaci of their capitals square in plan. Then, when they had to plan the archivolt moulding which was to be carried on the capital, they had almost of necessity to make it conform to this square outline. The result of this was, that the lights and shades were very broadly marked, the soffeits of the arches were broad and massive, and there was a great difficulty in devising any variety in the mouldings. The habit of regarding work in which this kind of broad effect predominated, led to a somewhat coarse, and equally strongly defined system of design in other parts of the fabric. In the plate tracery in windows, in the carving of tufts of foliage *à crochet* on the capitals, in the hard and vigorous designs of the flying buttresses (as, *e. g.*, at Chartres), and in many other ways, it was evident. The result is not unfrequently attractive. There is a vigour and decision about such work which is most striking; and, if it led somewhat to a coarseness of design in inferior hands, it must be admitted that, in the hands of the best men, it was almost as excellent as was possible.

In England—probably by some accident at first—the square

Romanesque capital was soon changed for one of circular outline, and with a result altogether extraordinary upon the whole course of our art. The same things happened to English as to foreign architects. They had to plan their arches to fit their capitals, and if these were circular in plan, it followed that the archivolt could never have a bold broad soffeit, but must be wrought with mouldings, all included within a circular or octagonal outline. Hence, the whole outline of English arch mouldings became different from that of French. The lights and shadows were more delicate; the different orders of the arch were shaded off softly and gradually one into the other; and there were no suggestions of broad shadows, but rather perhaps a certain lack of distinctness, which it was sought to atone for by increased delicacy and multiplicity of mouldings, drawn with subtle modulations of outline, cleverly varied in their relative proportions, and altogether far more skilful and admirable than any system of moulding which had elsewhere been invented. And just as the French system of moulding led naturally to an equally bold system of design in window tracery and other details generally, so in England the delicacy of eye and feeling which was accidentally fostered by the round abacus and its accompanying mouldings, produced, equally naturally, a more delicate kind of design in every other part of the fabric. So, though one often feels a certain lack of vigour and majesty about English work, there is seldom wanting a delicacy and refinement of character, which are at least equally valuable from an artistic point of view.

It cannot be supposed that our forefathers were at all ignorant of these differences in style. It happened not only that men travelled abroad a good deal either on errands of war or trade, but our kings held large tracts of the Continent during important periods; and—still more to the purpose—the clergy, from the constant necessity of going to Rome either on appeals to the Pope, or on institution to bishopries and abbacies, had of necessity frequent opportunities of seeing what foreign architects were doing. The religious houses, too, owed so much generally in the way of obedience to foreign heads, and often had to obey such stringent rules as to the planning and arrangement of their establishments, that it would be wonderful indeed if their works did not occasionally afford evidence that they had not neglected to study the detail of Foreign Architecture.

Let us now look at some of the examples which still exist, in which we can not only detect a gradual development in a new direction of some foreign style of building—which may be done, as we have seen, in all our earlier buildings—but also some

distinct employment of a foreign architect, or foreign workmen, in the midst of a period when the national art was flourishing with the utmost vigour. A few examples both at home and abroad will serve to show, that at least there was no very decided prejudice against such a course, and that, consequently, if ancient precedents are of any value in the attempt to restore ancient art, there is no reason why there should be any prejudice against such a course now.

Among these examples few are more to the point than those of Canterbury Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. Thanks mainly to Professor Willis, the history of the former is well known to most of us who take any interest in architecture; and we remember how, after the great fire of A.D. 1174, which destroyed the then existing church, after much delay, the monks summoned French and English artificers to their aid; and, among others, says Gervase—the monk who tells the story—"there had come a certain William of Sens, a man active and ready, and, as a workman, most skilled in wood and stone. Him, therefore, they retained, on account of his lively genius and good reputation, and dismissed the others. And to him, and to the providence of GOD, was the execution of the work committed." It scarcely needs to say that for the next few years, until ill-health compelled him to resign his post, this Frenchman carried on the works of our Metropolitical Cathedral, in a style which was thoroughly French, and closely like that of the cathedral in his own city of Sens. In another century, when it was wished to lay down a pavement in Becket's Crown, a somewhat similar course was pursued; and though it is not known whether the workmanship of it be foreign or not, it is beyond doubt that the design and much of the material are Italian. So, again, the stained glass, with which the church is so richly adorned, is so similar in detail to much French glass, and especially to that in the cathedral at Bourges, that it hardly admits of question that it was either executed in France, or, at least, by men who derived all their education from thence.

But if Canterbury Cathedral affords such interesting evidence, what is to be said of Westminster Abbey? That church so interwoven with all our English ideas in Church and State, the very centre, in some sort, for centuries of our whole system; whose beauty, as queen among all our English buildings, is admitted not only by every connoisseur, but equally by every one who ever comes on any errand, however humble, to London, and who would hardly venture to return without seeing its far-famed interior! That church which, in spite of neglect, in spite of changes of the most odious kind, still comes back to one in one's

dreams as, after all, the most lovely and loveable thing in Christendom, even when the mind has filled itself with all the recollections which visits to the great Continental cathedrals so abundantly supply! Here, indeed, it is hard to say how the work can be called English in the thorough sense of the word which is now insisted on. It is, on the contrary, as far as can be judged by internal evidence, the work of some English artist who had travelled largely abroad, had studied Continental examples, and had returned home full of the glories of what he had seen, anxious to engraft some of them on the genuine English stock, and careful nevertheless—as all good students ever are—not to erect a mere repetition of any thing he had ever seen, but rather something which should remind of, whilst it did not repeat, their beauties[1].

But it was not only the first architect of the Abbey who went abroad for the study of his art. The history of the Church affords evidence of the same feeling in each succeeding age. In A.D. 1258 Abbat Ware was compelled to go to Rome to obtain the confirmation of his election by the Pope. He remained there about two years, and when he returned brought with him two foreign workmen, one, Odericus by name, to lay a pavement of *Opus Alexandrinum* before the high Altar, which still remains in fair preservation; and the other, Petrus, "*civis Romanus*," a worker in Mosaic, who executed the works required for the decoration of the tomb of S. Edward. Some, too, have thought that they could detect a foreign hand in the execution of the sculptures on the beautiful monument of Aymer de Valence. However this may be, there is no doubt that the monument of Queen Philippa was executed by one "Hawkin" (of ?) "Liege," who is said to have come from France; or that the grand monument of Henry VII. was executed by an Italian, Torregiano, the contract with whom for the work is still extant.

Fountains Abbey affords another instance, in a remote valley, far from the seaboard, but still, I think, leaving no doubt as to the exercise of foreign influence on its construction. So close was the connexion of this house with Clairvaux, that it would be strange indeed if this were not so. Murdac, afterwards Archbishop of York, resigned the abbacy, which he had held for three years, in the year 1145. He was an Englishman, and was first of all a monk at Clairvaux, whence he went to Vauclair, near Laon, as

[1] This is the view of the present Surveyor to the Chapter, and I heartily agree in the probability of its being true. See *Gleanings from Westminster Abbey*. By G. G. Scott, R.A.

abbat, and was sent by S. Bernard from them to Fountains in A.D. 1142. The history of his successor, Abbat Richard, was mainly the same; for he, too, was abbat of Vauclair before coming to Fountains, and was for many years at the head of the latter house. No doubt during the time of these two abbats the nave and western entrance of the Abbey Church were founded; and it is remarkable that here, in the western porch or Narthex, with its beautiful coupled shafts and delicate arcades, as well as in the singular planning of the vaulting of the aisles, each bay being covered with a barrel vault at right angles to the axis of the building (and recalling the singular vaults of the church at Tournus) we see features of detail which would be perfectly consistent with the architecture which these abbats saw every where around them when they were at Clairvaux or Citeaux, but which were new and strange to English Art. Other examples of a similar kind might be multiplied. Suffice it to mention that the effigy for Walter de Merton's monument at Rochester was made by Master John, of Limoges, in A.D. 1276; and was one only of the many examples which were sent from thence in the Middle Ages, showing the skill of the Limoges enamellers.

Occasionally, too, a village church will be found which bears a markedly foreign impress. Few do this more than the fine church at Monks Kirby, near Lutterworth, which belonged to a religious house at Angers, and was no doubt designed by a French architect. So also the interesting church at Etchingham, whose history is said to explain in the same way its markedly foreign style. And so, again, the church at Lostwithiel, with its strange but beautiful spire, reminding every one who sees it of some church in Normandy or Brittany, rather than of any other English example.

If we cross the sea to Ireland, we have evidence of another mode of introducing foreign art; for here the churches and castles, built within the English pale after Strongbow's invasion, are distinctly the work of English architects, and in no degree developed from the remarkable early buildings in which Ireland was so rich. Cashel Cathedral (excluding, of course, the Irish Cormack's Chapel), the Cathedral of S. Canice, at Kilkenny, the castle at Ferns, and the Abbey at Jerpoint, are all instances of purely English art, and, moreover, of that form of it which we see in the thirteenth century in the South of England rather than the North. Here, in short, it was war which carried the art across the sea, just as it was in Spain, in Sicily, and elsewhere at the same time.

On the Continent we have, as might be expected, numerous

instances of the erection of buildings derived from foreign examples. One well-known case is the erection at Venice of a Byzantine church, modelled on Santa Sophia, and the copying of features, such as the pavement, which at Santa Sophia was laid with a waving surface, in order to typify the waves of the world on which the ship of the Church is tossed, and which was repeated absolutely, and no doubt with the same intention, at S. Mark's. S. Mark's, again, was copied by the Venetian colony settled in France, and probably gave the idea for the domed churches of which S. Front, Perigueux, is the central example. In Spain we have the curious example of the Cathedral at Gerona, designed and superintended by an architect from Narbonne; that of Barcelona, designed by Jayme Fabre of Mallorca; that of Santiago, built by Master Matthew in exact imitation of the great church of S. Sernin, at Toulouse, and the convent of Veruela, built in the most exact conformity to the rules of the order by Cistercian monks, who went from Citeaux for the purpose, and carried with them beyond all doubt the plans of the building. The Cathedral at Köln, built in emulation of that of Amiens; the Cathedral at Milan, built by a German; that at Genoa, certainly owing much to French influence; and the Church of San Francesco at Assisi, also very foreign in its style, all illustrate this common practice of the mediæval authorities. What the architects themselves did, we learn here and there incidentally. More than this we must not expect; for where we know so few even of the names of the artists of the Middle Ages, it were strange indeed if we knew any thing as to their mode of study. But the sketch-book of Wilars de Honicort supplies us with evidence as to a man in the thirteenth century who spent his time in rambling about making sketches; and the archives of the cathedral at Valencia tell us the story of the architect Pedro Balaguer, who in A.D. 1414, was sent by the authorities of the church there on a journey to Lérida, Narbonne, and other cities, to look at the various church steeples, in order that he might succeed in the design he was about to make for the steeple of his own cathedral.

Enough has now been said to prove at least this—that in the Middle Ages there was no objection whatever on the part of architects to the study and importation of foreign varieties of Gothic architecture, and that the extremely intimate connexion of the Church here with the Church on the Continent, and particularly the influence of the regular clergy, and their frequent connexion with foreign religious houses, made it impossible that artists should have worked in England at any time between the

twelfth and sixteenth centuries, without exhibiting some knowledge of what their brethren were doing on the other side of the water.

Here, then, we arrive at precisely the point to which it is necessary to come, when we have to meet the mere archæologist on this question. And when he repeats his assertion that the study of Continental Gothic Art is dangerous for English artists, we have but to confront him with the example of the very men to whom he appeals, in order to cut the ground from under his feet. But there is a much broader and more serious aspect of the whole question than this merely antiquarian view; and it were a great error to lose sight of it. This view assumes that the object of good architects is not simple copyism of certain examples, nor the mere revival of a bygone state of things, but the restoration of true principles, and the vigorous and persistent endeavour after originality in developments from them. The study of Gothic architecture has taken so wide a range of late years, and the number of Gothic buildings in course of erection is now so large, that a great deal has already been effected in the way not only of exact revival of our old style, but also in the way of development in fresh directions. It is so very difficult, so impossible one might almost say, to pursue any art in a purely antiquarian spirit, that we need not wonder that the attempt has failed when tried by men enamoured of their own national art, almost as conspicuously as when it has been essayed from the Greek, Roman, or Italian side. There are, as every one must see, certain developments and certain concessions to altered ideas and modern habits, without which any architecture would be intolerable. And accordingly, it is well-nigh impossible to find any buildings erected in modern times which are not more or less departures from the exact type afforded by old examples. At the same time, the most original and vigorous, because the most sensible, of these buildings, will always be found to be the work of the men who have studied with the most zeal and enthusiasm the best ancient examples. Indeed, were originality so much wanting as some critics pretend, it would be impossible to divide men into schools, to separate one man's style from another's, or to recognize so easily as we now do the handiwork of each architect of any real distinction, even at the present day. Then, if every modern work is, of very necessity, so unlike any particular example of old work, it is certain that it is no more so than was each example of imported art or work done by foreign artists in the Middle Ages. And it is equally certain, also, that the style which would result from really careful study of foreign examples

would not be an exact repetition of any particular foreign building, or portion of a building. We will now, therefore, consider shortly the way in which the architect ought to pursue this study of foreign art, and then some of the directions in which it seems that such study would be of especial value to us.

First of all, then, it is impossible to say too strongly that the first duty of all artists is to know, not something, but every thing about their national art. Who can believe in the real zeal of the man who requires the excitement of foreign travel to induce him to study his art? Is it not certain that if he cared for it with more than a half love, every English county would have been examined and studied, and its old remains sketched and catalogued, before he went further? Few, indeed, it is to be feared, know the full loveliness of English art who have not wandered, knapsack on back, and sketch-book in hand, in all directions over the country. And it may be asserted with perfect safety that if men first of all did this, they would never afterwards be able to throw off the sweet influence of such an education. There are spots in this land as sacred to every real lover of art as any in the world; but they are, for the most part, homely, modest, easy of access, and therefore too liable to be overlooked. And if any argument in favour of the study of foreign examples were to lead to greater neglect of them than is already shown, it were a thousand-fold better to leave such arguments unsaid. But with this preliminary caution, it is difficult to say how much and how endless is the store of noble works which the architect may study on the Continent. The vast sphere over which examples are spread, the variety of climate which they are built to suit, the difference of material, of processes, of manners, and of wants, ensure all that variety of treatment which are not only so interesting, but also so constantly required at our hands when, in the practice of our art, we become so cosmopolitan as many of us nowadays are, building in all parts of the world, and of necessity under the most varying conditions. The characteristics of Continental architecture vary, as might be expected in various countries and districts, and the lessons to be learnt are accordingly of the most varying kind. In France, for instance, where we have in the mediæval remains, not the work of one wellunited kingdom, but of a variety of provinces which have by slow degrees become consolidated in a great empire, the lessons are most various. The student finds there the stream of Romanesque art coming from the south to the north, sending out here a shoot and there a shoot, and developing gradually into provincial variations of the most distinct and well-marked kind. The per-

fection of French art of the best period is probably that which we see in the old Ile-de-France, and the churches here and around it are among the finest and most complete the world has ever seen. Such cathedrals as those of Chartres and Bourges, Paris, Amiens, and Rouen, are each, not only a great work of art, but, at the same time, a great Christian epic, in which not only are the grouping and general design admirable, but in which also the subordinate parts illustrate in their arrangement, their ornamentation, and their sculpture, the whole Christian scheme in the most marvellous manner. The English sculpture of the Middle Ages is poor and insignificant in comparison with that which is found there. Glorious as is the west front of Wells, it pales before those great works, and at the same time the character of the work we see in it is so much like that of some of them as to show how little risk there can be in the study of works so identical in their character.

Another province—that of Perigord—possesses equal value in another way. For here, where Byzantine and not Romanesque influence was paramount in the first instance, we see a succession of churches in which an attempt has been made to combine the use of the dome with the pointed arch; and one can imagine few combinations which are likely to afford more legitimate openings to us than this. It happens, indeed, that the attempt was never made in England, though the nave of the Temple Church and the glorious lantern of Ely, show that the feeling which suggested it was not wanting here. But on the Continent it was made often, and generally with astonishing success. In Germany, the Cathedral at Aachen, and the Church of S. Gereon, at Köln; in France, S. Front Perigueux, and the cathedral at Angoulême; in Italy, the Baptistery at Pisa, the cathedrals of S. Mark, at Venice, of Florence, and of Siena, and the Church of Santa Maria at Arezzo; and in Spain, the Church at Toro, the Cathedral at Zamora, and the oldest of the two cathedrals at Salamanca, are examples, among others, of the varying way in which it was sought to introduce this great feature, which both in its origin and in its form has so much more affinity to the lines of Gothic buildings than to those of buildings of any other style. It is much to be wished that this one development, at any rate, may ere long be seen in some grand town church; and following old precedent, it may be in one of these two ways, either as the vast circular nave, or place of assembly for the people, or as the smaller crown or shrine in the centre of which stands the Altar, whilst to its west is the long nave opening into it.

But this wealth of examples of domical churches is one way

only in which France is so rich. Another district—that of the Puy de Dome and Vélay—is full of striking examples of parti-coloured construction. Here all the buildings are built of dark scoriæ and light stone, contrasting strongly in colour, and most piquant in their effect. In principle they are identical with the buildings of two kinds of stones which we have in some English examples (as, *e.g.*, at Irchester and Strixton in Northamptonshire), or with others of flint and stone; but they are carried out more completely, and undoubtedly deserve the most careful study. Nor less do they claim the attention of the student for their solid and permanent mode of construction. They are built throughout without timber; and, decay of stone alone excepted, there seems to be scarcely any reason why they should not last for ever.

Here, then, in France only, we see in how many directions the study of mediæval art may fairly take us. Nor is it otherwise in Italy. There, indeed, it is necessary to be more cautious, because Gothic art was never so frankly accepted as it was here, and the mediæval architects always wrought as though they were to a certain extent under the influence of classic traditions. Hence, there are many details of their work, which no one who has thoroughly studied English Gothic will ever be inclined to tolerate. Their mouldings, their traceries, their carving of foliage, their avowedly unreal and unsafe modes of construction, are all open to severe criticism; but, on the other hand, their skill in the introduction of colour in construction, the refined delicacy of their decorations, and the marvellous beauties of their mosaics and paintings—so truly architectural in their character—are so remarkable, that it would be in the highest degree pernicious were we to allow ourselves to be deterred from their study. This, at least, is certain, that if we studied these Italian works more carefully, our attempts in the same direction would be far more likely to have a successful result, would be more modest, more refined, and altogether more gracious in their air than they are. It has already been shown, how our own forefathers saw nothing wrong in the importation of an Italian pavement and shrine for our noblest church, whilst the paintings on the vaulting of Salisbury Cathedral, so far as one can trace their outlines through the barbarous coating of whitewash which covers them, appear to be similar in their general scheme to such early Italian paintings as those of the Church of S. Francesco, at Assisi, or the less known but most interesting works at Avignon and Toulouse.

Once more; who can study the history of brickwork in the

Middle Ages, without seeing how thoroughly fragmentary our knowledge of the subject is, if we confine ourselves to our own country. Until a late date, our examples are few and far between. Little Wenham Hall is almost the solitary English example in the thirteenth, as the great church at Hull is in the fourteenth century, and neither of them shows any special skill in the use of the material. How different is the case in the north of Germany and the Low Countries, for there, where no stones were to be had, without enormous expense of transport, and where bricks were the natural—indeed almost the only—building materials to be had, men showed the greatest skill in their making and use, and have left us a vast number of buildings from the stern but noble Romanesque of the old German convent of Jerichow, and the stately simplicity of Norwegian Roeskilde, to the florid exuberance of the fifteenth century, gabled, pinnacled, and crocketed civic buildings of Lübeck, or the rich Church of S. Katharine at Brandenburg. Nor is the north of Europe alone in this respect. France affords us examples of a very early date in the great church of S. Sernin at Toulouse, whilst brick buildings of later age abound in the district around that city; the north of Italy is rich in the extreme in the best brickwork ever executed any where—delicate, graceful, and lovely in its detail; and finally, some parts of Spain, especially the valley of the Ebro, and the neighbourhood of Toledo, are full of examples which show how the Moorish architects contrived, long after their race had been overthrown by the Christians, to infuse into the works which they erected for their conquerors, much of the Eastern character which their own brick buildings had always borne.

Space would fail for the further illustration in detail of the various directions in which the same kind of novelty of development in entire harmony with the traditions of our own national art, might be discovered. But a few words may not be out of place as to the limits within which they ought to be studied. It seems to be very easy to draw certain broad and defined lines between those varieties of old buildings which it is safe to adopt, and those in the study of which there is danger. One great rule pervades all good architecture, viz.:—that it must first of all be real and truthful in its construction, ornamentation, and arrangement. This cannot be insisted on too often nor too earnestly; for without it we can have no good art, whilst with it we shall at least have honesty, which is the first essential in the work, as well as in the character of the artist.

Let us examine a little, and we shall see how easy this rule is

in its application. In all architecture, the first principles to be observed are those of sound construction; and no architecture is worth any thing in which these are not thoroughly cared for. Greek architecture was, in its origin, the result of the best known mode of construction: the columns placed at intervals not too great for the use of the flat stone lintel; the flat roof perfectly suited to the climate; the marked architectural character given to the columns, which did all the work, so to speak, of the building, were all evidences of right feeling on the part of the architect. So, too, the delicate lines of the mouldings were suited to the intense brilliancy of the light and shade in the Greek climate. So, again, Roman architecture was honest enough generally; and so, undoubtedly, was Gothic. The aim of the student must be therefore in all cases to be very critical as to the extent to which this honesty was thorough in its application. Those Italian arches which required an iron tie to hold them together are examples of dishonest building; so in a less degree is the construction of ornament; the omission of members which, when they are seen, appear to be necessary; the erection of work merely for show, as, *e.g.*, the false gables of the buildings at Pisa (emulated, it is true, at Lincoln and Salisbury) and the west fronts of the Brunswick churches, towering up high above the naves of which they pretend to be the ends.

And again, the student who is thoroughly penetrated with a sense of the artistic excellence and value of English work, will naturally be careful to look for such analogies between it and Continental work, as go to prove that the junction of the two would not produce any kind of clashing. Thus, to take one well-known example. The design of the arcade, which carries the vast superstructure of the Ducal Palace, at Venice, is one which might be found any where in the north of Europe, bold, vigorous, massive, and thoroughly Gothic. The traceried arcade above it, and the vast expanse of marble diaper on the wall above that, are, in the main, Italian in their origin and style. Yet all three harmonize perfectly; and it follows, that the same kind of traceried arcade, and the same kind of constructional diaper of marble, might be used here with no less harmonious an effect over one of our purely Gothic arcades. In a general way, again, we find in foreign countries a vast number of examples of some feature of which we have either solitary or very few instances. Yet if these few instances were allowable, then it cannot be wrong to multiply them. In France we find the majority of churches groined in stone, here a very small minority. There the apsidal termination is all but universal, here a rare exception. There the

square abacus to the capital is the rule, here not; and so on *ad infinitum*.

In all these respects, without absolutely copying the particular feature, we may take the hint, and so engraft on our own work some evidence of the study of Continental work, which shall yet not have any of the character of mere copyism. Indeed, nothing will more thoroughly break the artist of any tendency to copying, than the largeness of mind and taste to which foreign travel so much conduces. It is no more difficult for the man who has lived in mind with great artists to mould what they have done to his own purposes, than it is for the sculptor or the painter to do so after the study of the great masters of their several crafts. There is a certain limit to originality in all the arts, and it requires no proof that the mediæval artists who carried on the traditions of their art with only gradual modifications, were no more original than are those at the present day who are reviving the same traditions. Painters, sculptors, and musicians, all practise their arts under great limitations as to originality. They cannot wisely ignore the work of their forerunners, for they have the same duty to perform towards nature, and generally the same bounds beyond which they cannot pass. So, the architect, who is restricted by certain imperative conditions as to construction, material, and climate, is not in truth very much more fettered if he is restricted in some degree also as to style. But he will do wisely, without doubt, to enlarge his knowledge and his appreciation of style in art, by study every where of the best examples; and if this is done in the spirit of the artist, and not in the temper of a mere tradesman, he will drink in every where lessons of unspeakable value, which will mark themselves with a certain charm on all the work that he does. He will be incapable of mere copying, for this is the result of careless or unloving study of the past; and if he have first of all made himself thoroughly master of the artistic treasures of his own country, he will never be led away by the study of foreign examples to forget them, where they are really worthy of admiration, for they are not the real students of the foreign Gothic art of the Middle Ages who are conspicuous by their attempts to introduce it, *pur et simple*, into England.

GEORGE EDMUND STREET.

Science and Prayer.

THE proverb, which warns the shoemaker not to go "beyond his last," expresses in a concise form the injurious influence of exclusive adherence to any one pursuit. The devotees of any single branch of knowledge are very liable to the temptation of regarding every thing from their own point of view, and of applying the instruments and keys of their own craft to the measurement and solution of all other problems. Theologians are sometimes accused, and not always unjustly, of intruding into the province of science, and imposing their own arbitrary interpretations on Nature. The student of Nature, on the other hand, falls into an error not less grievous, when he pushes his conclusions beyond the legitimate limits of his premisses, and argues the falsity of theological dogmas from the experimental tests of physical science. Theologians were certainly wrong when they saw in the miracle of Joshua the refutation of the Copernican system; for the miracle took place, not to establish an astronomical conclusion, but to enforce a religious principle: it proclaimed, not that the Copernican system was wrong, but that GOD is Sovereign over His own creation. But Galileo was equally to blame when, not content with defending the Copernican system, he applied his telescope to the task of Biblical exegesis. According to the most approved theory of light, there seems to be no insuperable difficulty in believing that the solar light might have been supernaturally prolonged above the horizon after the sun had set, without any interference with the motion of the earth. And Joshua, in describing the miracle, used, as even men of science still use, the language of appearances. He described the miracle as it appeared to those who witnessed it, without encumbering his narrative with what concerned him not—its scientific explanation.

But theologians, at least, have profited by experience since the days of Galileo. They no longer seek to impede the progress of science by binding her in the fetters of foregone conclusions. They are ready to welcome her as a fellow-labourer in another province of the Creator's kingdom. They are willing that she should enjoy the utmost freedom, and they have no fear or jealousy of her achievements so long as she keeps within her own borders,

and observes her neighbour's landmarks. It is not scientific research that they object to, but rather that unscientific dogmatism which, stepping out of its proper domain, prescribes laws in a region where it has neither knowledge nor authority. These mutual usurpations on the part of different sciences Bacon reckons among the chief hindrances to the progress of knowledge. "Another error," he says, "is that after the distribution of particular arts and sciences, men have abandoned universality or *philosophia prima:* which cannot but cease and stop all progression. For no perfect discovery can be made upon a flat or a level: neither is it possible to discover the more remote and deeper parts of any science, *if you stand but upon the level of the same science, and ascend not to a higher science.*"

Again:—"Another error that hath some connexion with this latter is, that men have used to infect their meditations, opinions, and doctrines, with some conceits which they have most admired, *or some sciences which they have most applied;* and given all things else a tincture according to them, utterly untrue and improper. . . . So Cicero, when, reciting the several opinions of the nature of the soul, he found a musician that held the soul was but a harmony, saith pleasantly, *Hic ab arte sua non recessit.* But of these conceits Aristotle speaketh seriously and wisely, when he saith, *Qui respiciunt ad pauca de facili pronunciant.*"

And further on he administers an impartial rebuke to metaphysical and physical philosophers respecting their unlawful invasion of each other's territories. "This misplacing," he says, "hath caused a deficience, or at least a great improficience in the sciences themselves. For the handling of final causes, mixed with the rest in physical inquiries, hath interrupted the severe and diligent inquiry of all real and physical causes, and given men the occasion to stay upon these satisfactory and specious causes, to the great arrest and prejudice of further discovery . . . . *Not because those final causes are not true, and worthy to be inquired, being kept within their own province;* but because their excursions into the limits of physical causes hath bred a vastness and solitude in that track. *For otherwise, keeping their precincts and borders, men are extremely deceived if they think there is an enmity or repugnance at all between them.* (*Advancement of Learning*, pp. 33, 34. 94, 95, Markby's Edition.)

It would be well if the disciples of the inductive philosophy were somewhat more mindful of these admirable warnings of their great master. Whatever sins may be laid at the door of theology in other days, certainly in our day the aggression is generally from the side of science, which, not content with tole-

ration and good neighbourhood on the part of the Church, aspires to dictate the articles of her creed, and prescribe her very forms of devotion. Of this aggressive disposition on the part of science the recent attack on special prayer is an instance. The prayer against the cholera and cattle-plague cannot be accused of encroaching on any of the rights and privileges of science. It moves in another sphere, and is simply based on our recognition of a GOD Whose love is infinite, and Whose power is equal to His love. It is strictly framed on Bacon's advice, "being kept within its own province," and not venturing on any "excursions into the limits of physical causes." Yet Natural Science, in so far as it is represented by Professor Tyndall, turns round upon us with a scowl; and tells us that, in the opinion of "the great majority of sane persons," we are little better than fools for believing that our prayers can avail to stop the progress of the pestilence. Being thus rudely and wantonly assailed, we may do our best to repel the attack without incurring the imputation of enmity against physical science.

The argument against special prayer falls under two heads. It is assumed, in the first place, that such prayer is inconsistent with "the necessary character of natural laws;" and secondly, that it is repugnant to our belief in the unchangeableness of GOD. Let us examine the argument in this order.

I. It must be observed, *in limine*, that the first objection is valid against *all* miracles, or against *none*. That is the broad issue. Either the violation of a natural law is impossible, and no such violation ever took place; or one or more violations have taken place, and therefore there is no antecedent impossibility—in other words, natural laws have no "necessary character."

Now it so happens, that belief in the violation, or suspension, or counteraction (however we may express it) of natural law, belongs to the essence of Christianity. Professor Tyndall's position is philosophically false, or Christianity is an imposture. For Christianity is founded on two distinct violations of the order of nature: the miraculous Incarnation of the SON of GOD, and His miraculous Resurrection from the dead. If these two miracles are admitted as true, the argument against miracles from the uniformity of nature breaks down on the threshold of the inquiry; for it is clear that what *has* taken place, *may* again take place. On the other hand, if GOD the SON was not "born of a pure Virgin," and rose not from the dead, *cadit quæstio*: "our faith is vain; we are yet in our sins." If Christianity is indeed a fiction, and its "noble army of martyrs" a crowd of

weak-minded enthusiasts, it really is not worth while to debate about miracles dan the power of prayer. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The nobility of human nature is gone, and we are at once degraded to the level of the beasts that perish. "They that deny a GOD, destroy man's nobility: for certainly man is of kin to the beasts by his body; and if he be not of kin to GOD by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature. It destroys likewise magnanimity, and the raising of human nature; for take an example of a dog, and mark what a generosity and courage he will put on when he finds himself maintained by a man, who to him is instead of a GOD, or *melior natura;* which courage is manifestly such as that creature, without that confidence of a better nature than his own, could never attain. So man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon Divine protection and favour, gathereth a force and faith, which human nature in itself could not obtain." (Bacon's *Essay on Atheism.*)

But human nature can never love and rest in a GOD Who is merely a scientific abstraction, any more than it can love and trust in electricity or gravitation. To kindle love in my soul, I must fix my affections on a *Person;* and that Person must be "higher than I," else my love will degenerate into instinct or lust. He must also be a partaker, in some way, of my own nature; One Who can sympathize with me in my joys and sorrows. "When the precept of love has been given, an image must be set before the eyes of those who are called upon to obey it, an ideal or type of man which may be noble and amiable enough to raise the whole race, and make the meanest members of it sacred with reflected glory. Did not CHRIST do this? Did the command to love go forth to those who had never seen a human being they could revere? Could His followers turn upon Him and say—How can we love a creature so degraded, full of vile wants and contemptible passions, whose little life is most harmoniously spent when it is an empty round of eating and sleeping; a creature destined for the grave and for oblivion, when his allotted term of fretfulness and folly has expired? Of this race CHRIST Himself was a member; and to this day is it not the best answer to all blasphemers of the species, the best consolation when our sense of its degradation is keenest, that a human brain was behind His forehead, and a human heart beating in His breast, and that within the whole creation of GOD nothing more elevated or more attractive has yet been found than He? . . . An eternal glory has been shed upon the human race by the love CHRIST bore to it[1]."

[1] *Ecce Homo*, Macmillan, 1866, p. 164. This remarkable book, if I may

And it is of this glory that the cold hand of science would unfeelingly rob us. If Professor Tyndall's argument is true, CHRIST and the Supernatural must perish together. And then what remains? "All is vanity and vexation of spirit." When the heavens over us are brass, and the ground under our feet is iron, and the pestilence is desolating our homes, it is but cold comfort to be called upon to admire the beautiful uniformity of nature's inexorable laws. Can they heal a broken heart, or change a sinful one? I may be stricken by a Father's hand, and still love the hand that smites me. But to send me for consolation to the blind evolutions of a heartless Fate—this is mockery indeed!

"Whenever I find my faith in miraculous agency vacillating within me, the image of my GOD seems to be fading away from my eyes. He ceases to be for me GOD the free, the living, the personal; the GOD with Whom the soul converses, as with a master and friend. And that holy dialogue once interrupted, what is left us! How does life become sad! How does it lose its illusions! Reduced to the satisfaction of mere physical wants, to eat, to drink, to sleep, to make money, deprived of all horizon, how puerile does our maturity appear, how sorrowful our old age, how meaningless our anxieties! No more mystery, no more innocence, no more infinity, no longer any heaven above our heads, no more poesy. Ah! be sure: the incredulity which rejects the miracle has a tendency to unpeople heaven, and to disenchant the earth. The supernatural is the natural sphere of the soul. It is the essence of its faith, of its hope, of its love. I know how specious criticism is, how victorious its arguments often appear; but I know one thing besides, and perhaps I might here even appeal to your own (sceptic's) testimony; in ceasing to believe in what is miraculous, the soul finds that it has lost the secret of Divine life; henceforth it is urged downwards towards the abyss, soon it lies on the earth, and not seldom in the dirt. . . . When philosophy has no other GOD than the universe, no other man than the chief of the mammalia, what is it but a mere system of Zoology? Zoology constitutes the whole science of the epoch of the materialists; and, to speak plainly,

venture to express an opinion, seems to me susceptible throughout of an orthodox interpretation, with the exception of the Author's account of our Lord's Temptation. But as he has avowedly reserved the discussion of all theological questions for his next volume, it is but fair to give him at present the benefit of the doubt. The book is, in many respects, a noble contribution to the ethical philosophy of Christianity; it is, in fact, a sort of theological *torso*, strikingly beautiful as far as it goes: but it wants a head—a defect which, it is to be hoped, the gifted Author will remedy in his next Essay.

that is our position at the present day." (*Conversations Théologiques*, pp. 169, 178, par Edmond Scherer. Quoted in Guizot's *Meditations on Christianity*.)

This, then, being the issue before us, we have a right to ask Professor Tyndall, and all whom he represents, *to speak out*, and tell us plainly what they mean. They have committed themselves to an argument which is as fatal to Christianity and the entire sphere of the supernatural, as it is to "Lambeth Prayers." They must, therefore, sacrifice Christianity to their logic, or their logic to Christianity. It is really not fair to speak of GOD and of Christianity, when their reasoning would banish both from the universe. If the Government of the world is but a sort of limited monarchy, where the Sovereign is hemmed in by a network of mechanical laws, and cannot issue a decree or express a wish but in obedience to precedent and through the voice of His ministers, then, whatever fine name we use, the object of our thought is no GOD at all; we mean Necessity, or Fate, or some other abstraction equally shadowy and unsubstantial, and we had better say so. It is not right to employ Christian language as a cloak for pagan sentiments.

And, after all, what does the devotee of physical science hope to gain by denying Christianity, and eliminating the supernatural from the catalogue of his *credenda?* His dreary creed is not likely to add to the dignity or happiness of human nature; but will it help to solve the riddles which encompass man's life, whether he look before him or behind? Are there no difficulties still remaining? Is there no ghostly apparition behind the framework of nature, haunting his vision, but eluding his grasp; and which all the spells of science cannot lay? What is man himself but a supernatural phenomenon? His first appearance upon earth is a stupendous miracle. It was an innovation on the previous order of nature, greater than a resurrection from the dead. This much is admitted by men who certainly cannot be accused of any inordinate reverence for traditional views, and whom even Professor Tyndall would probably place among "the majority of sane persons." "In our attempt to account," says Sir Charles Lyell, "for the origin of species, we find ourselves brought face to face with the working of a law of development of so high an order as to stand nearly in the same relation as the DEITY Himself to man's finite understanding; a law capable of adding new and powerful causes, such as the moral and intellectual faculties of the human race, to a system of nature which had gone for millions of years without the intervention of an analogous cause." (*Antiquity of Man*, ch. xxxiii.)

This distinguished writer, it is true, endeavours to evade the force of his own admission by the aid of a theory which, however plausible on the surface, will not bear a close examination. The theory, in brief, is as follows:—Humanity, now and then, under the leadership of some king of thought, is observed to make, as it were, a leap up to a higher point of civilization. So that "if, in conformity with the theory of progression, we believe mankind to have risen from a rude and humble starting-point, such leaps may have successively introduced higher and higher forms and grades of intellect; but, at a much remoter period, may have cleared at one bound the space which separated the highest stage of the unprogressive intelligence of the inferior animals, from the first and lowest form of improvable reason manifested by man."

The answer to this is very simple. The theory is a naked assumption, without a single fact to support it. The parallel which Sir Charles Lyell institutes between a transmutation of species by a series of leaps and the start which civilization occasionally makes by the happy discovery of some great genius is, in reality, no parallel at all. It fails in all the requisites of a legitimate analogy. Men of the present day have, of course, a larger knowledge and a wider experience than the men of six thousand years ago. This is, in fact, one of the barriers which separate man from the inferior animals. Each generation of mankind enters into the labours of its predecessors; and, as it dies, leaves the scaffolding higher up the temple of knowledge than it found it: whereas each of the lower animals starts in the race of life as if the first of its species, with no accumulation of knowledge from the tribes that went before it, however far back the line may extend. But, though we can thus trace along the course of successive ages a gradual increase in the *product* of the human intellect, and mark at times a sudden impulse given to the progress of the race by the genius of one man, experience negatives the notion of any advancement in *the intellect itself*, by means of "leaps" or otherwise. The human intellect of the present day is not superior to the intellect of the age of Pericles. It stands on a higher level as regards knowledge, but not as regards intrinsic power; it is richer in external possessions, but not in internal endowments. By inventing the telescope, Galileo enabled the eye to see farther than it ever saw before; but the eye itself remained unchanged. And it is the same with regard to other discoveries. The discoverer raises the general intellect—by a "leap," if Sir Charles Lyell likes the expression—to a terrace overlooking that on which he found it. He thus extends its horizon, and enables it to see much which it could not see on the

"flat" whereon it stood before. But the general intellect is not thereby intrinsically changed, nor acquires new powers, any more than a man is made taller by going some steps up a ladder. In comparing our own age with the palmiest days of ancient Greece, we may truly say that

> "What sages would have died to learn
> Is taught by cottage dames."

But the "cottage dames" are not therefore intellectually superior to Plato and Aristotle.

This, then, is the first fallacy of Sir Charles Lyell's theory. He confounds the accumulation of knowledge with the progress of the intellect. Then, again, if the theory is to work, the intellect, at least of him who makes the "leap," ought to maintain itself in his descendants at the high level which it reached in himself. But this is far from being the case. Genius does not go by natural descent. In the third generation, if not sooner, it generally falls back to the "flat" from which it leapt. We have no race of Newtons or of Bacons, of Dantes or of Shakespeares. But we ought to have—according to Sir Charles Lyell's theory. If the analogy is good for any thing, what it really proves is, that mankind ought long ago to have lapsed back across "the space" which their progenitor "cleared at one bound," when he escaped from the monkeys. The existence of the human race is a standing refutation of the theory of "leaps."

With respect to Mr. Darwin's theory, it is enough to say of it that even Sir Charles Lyell, who clings to Mr. Darwin's view, has been obliged to invent a theory of his own, equally baseless, in order to fill up the hiatus which separates Mr. Darwin's premisses from his conclusion. Mr. Darwin has not adduced a single case of a real transformation of species. But if the fact were otherwise, and man were really descended from the ape, Mr. Darwin's own hypothesis would still require that the transition should be so gradual, the transmutation so drawn out and attenuated by the length of the process, that the highest specimen of the ape could be seen merging, by scarcely perceptible lines, into the lowest specimen of man. But it is not so. A wide gulf still divides the gorilla from the man, and there is no intermediate brain to span the intervening chasm[2]. There is a missing link, which Mr. Darwin does not account for. Sir Charles Lyell has attempted to supply the omission by his theory of "leaps;" with what success, let the reader judge.

[2] See Sir C. Lyell, *On the Antiquity of Man*, p. 491.

The appearance of man on the earth, then, is a miracle. The *fact* of his appearance, in the first place, is miraculous. Here is a being, who stands out among the mechanical and animal forces of nature as a king and controller, "a creature, yet a cause[3]," ruling, guiding, subduing them at his pleasure. He has views, aims, plans, and he compels Nature to turn aside from her own avocations to execute his will. By the exercise of an independent volition, he creates effects directly contrary to those which else would have resulted from the operations of physical laws. Where did this strange being come from? To what law or agency did he owe his beginning? Experience tells us nothing, nor does history, outside the Bible, of the circumstances which preceded and accompanied man's introduction on the earth; but Reason forces us to the conclusion that his origin is due to a supernatural Cause—a Cause, that is, outside and above both his own nature, and the nature of all that stands below him in creation. This is a necessary inference. For the only alternative is an eternal, uncreated race—that is to say, an effect without a cause; which would itself be a miracle, with the addition of being an absurdity into the bargain. Moreover, such an hypothesis is flatly contradicted by physical science, which points to a time when life, such as we know it, could not exist for a moment on the earth.

And if the *fact* of man's entrance on the earth is a miracle, so is also the *manner* of it. Man, as we know him now, is generated from a microscopic cell, and arrives at maturity by passing through an intervening stage of helplessness, both of mind and body. But this could not have been the manner of man's original creation. Holy Scripture tells us that the first pair were created at once, in full stature of mind and body; and Reason confirms the teaching of Revelation. If our first parents had been created in a state of infancy, the first day of their life would have been the last, unless indeed we suppose them nursed by a daily miracle. In the present order of nature, life, whether of man, beast, or plant, begins in the germ, and realizes its idea through a process of natural development. According to the common saying, "the child is the father of the man;" the oak springs from the acorn. But this

[3] "Son of immortal Seed, high destined Man!
Know thy dread gift—a creature, yet a cause;
Each mind is its own centre, and it draws
Home to itself, and moulds in its thought's span
All outward things, the vassals of its will,
Aided by Heaven, by earth unthwarted still."
Lyra Apostolica, p. 48.

order is reversed in the Biblical account of creation. There we have *first* the full-grown individual, endowed with reproductive power: "the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself;" and so with all other forms of life. Each species, man included, appeared in its perfect type; and *then* itself became a creator, with delegated power. Such is the teaching of the inspired record; and such, too, is the deduction of human reason. "For, as a necessity of thought, we are led to refer the potential existence of each thing to the actual existence of something before; a flower, for instance, owes its potential existence in the seed to the actual existence of another flower before it." (Sir A. Grant's *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, p. 188.)

We are driven, then, by the sheer force of our reasoning faculties, to take refuge in a miracle as the only possible solution of man's origin. In our last analysis, we must reach a point where the present order of nature in the production of our species fails; we encounter a man and a woman, the parents of the human race, but parentless themselves, and without any experience of childhood. What could be a greater infringement on the order of nature than this? In comparison with it, a resurrection from the dead, or Providential deliverance from pestilence, is insignificant. What, in fact, can be a greater miracle than the universe itself? Whence came it? Who gave it its laws? For the very word *law* is meaningless, unless we suppose a lawgiver. The world, with all its complex machinery, must have come from the hands of a personal Creator. For a world created out of nothing by an all-powerful Being, though a mystery, involves no absurdity; but a world without a Creator, and therefore without a beginning, is a contradiction in terms and an absurdity. If we think at all on the subject, we must at last reach a First Cause. The great miracle is GOD Himself. Grant that, and other miracles are not only possible, but probable also. Deny it, and you merely exchange one class of miracles for another. It is idle to attack the miracles of providential superintendence and arrangement, and leave the miracles of creation untouched. A wise general does not advance into an enemy's country, and leave an overpowering army hanging on his rear to cut off his retreat.

And this is what Professor Tyndall has done in asserting "the necessary character of natural laws." His assertion is contradicted by facts, and repudiated by men whom even he would admit to be "sane." Let us take one of the most important of these laws by way of test—the law of gravitation.

"Can any reason be assigned," asks Dr. Whewell, "why the law *must* obtain? The answer to this is, that no reason, at all satisfactory, can be given why such a law must of necessity be what it is, but that very strong reasons can be pointed out why, for the beauty and advantage of the system, the present one is better than others." (*Bridgewater Treatise*, p. 185.)

"No further insight into why the apple falls," says Grove, "is assigned by the force of gravitation: by the latter expression we are enabled to relate it most usefully to other phenomena, but still we know no more of the particular phenomenon, than that under certain circumstances the apple does fall." (*Correlation of Physical Forces*, p. 18. Fourth Edition.)

"Gravitation," says Sir W. Hamilton, "is only a fact generalized by induction and observation; and its rejection, therefore, violates no law of thought. When we talk, therefore, of the *necessity* of external phenomenon, the expression is improper, if the necessity be only an inference of induction, and not involved in any canon of intelligence. For induction proves to us only what is, not what must be—the actual, *not the necessary.*" (*Lectures on Metaphysics*, vol. ii. p. 195. Cf. *Lectures on Logic*, vol. iii. Lecture xxxii.)

"What I call attraction," says Newton, "may be produced by impulsion, or by other means unknown to me. I only use the word attraction to signify generally a force of some kind by which bodies tend reciprocally towards one another, *whatever the cause may be.*" (*Optics*, iii. Quæst. 31.)

Again:—"*It is absurd to suppose that necessity presides over nature.* For a blind necessity being every where the same at all times and in every place, the variety of things could not result from it. And consequently the universe, with the order of its parts appropriated to the variety of times and places, *can only have its origin from one primitive Being who has ideas and will.*" "*At every step astronomy finds the limit of physical causes, and consequently the trace of the action of God.*" (*Princ. Schol. Gen.; and Four Letters to Dr. Bentley.*)

Professor Tyndall has invoked the name of Galileo *in terrorem* against the believers in the efficacy of prayer; but the following passage from that philosopher's *Dialogue on the Two Systems of the World* shows what he thought of the alleged "necessary character of natural laws." *Simplicio*, who defends the Ptolemaic system, being asked by *Salviati* (Galileo) to account for heavy bodies falling downwards, replies—"The cause of this effect is notorious, and every one knows it to be gravity." "You are wrong, Signor Simplicio," answers Salviati; "you should have said that

every one *knows that it is called* gravity. But I do not ask you the name, but the nature *(essenza)* of the thing, of which nature you do not know one tittle more than you know of the nature of the rotatory motion of the stars, except it be the name which has been given to the one, and made familiar and domestic, by the frequent experience we have of it many thousand times a day. But of the principle or virtue by which a stone falls to the ground, *we really know no more than we know of the principle which carries it upwards when thrown into the air, or which carries the moon round its orbit, except, as I have said, the name of gravity." (Dialogo sopra i Due Massimi Sistemi del Mondo, Tolemaico e Copernicano, p.* 230. Fiorenza, 1632.)

Even Mr. J. S. Mill, with all his zeal for the philosophy of experience, admits that if the existence of GOD be posited, there is no valid objection against miracles. "In the case of an alleged miracle," he says, "the assertion is . . . . that the effect was defeated, not in the absence, but in consequence of a counteracting cause, namely, a direct interposition of an act of the will of some Being who has power over nature; and in particular of a Being whose will, being assumed to have endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects, *may well be supposed able to counteract them.* A miracle (as was justly observed by Brown) is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect supposed to be introduced by the introduction of a new cause. Of the adequacy of that cause, if present, there can be no doubt; *and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle is the improbability that any such cause existed*[4]."

The truth is, the only necessary laws are the laws of the conscience and the intellect, the axioms of moral and mental science. We feel that the sense of right and wrong is an original principle of our constitution, and we cannot imagine any system of things under which, our nature remaining what it is, we should cease to have this sense. Nations and individuals may disagree as to what is right in particular cases; but all admit that there *is* a right, and that the right ought always to be followed: both accept the major premiss, and differ only as to the minor. This distinction supplies an answer to an objection of Mr. Mill's.

[4] *System of Logic*, vol. ii. p. 159. Cf. his *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, p. 142, where he selects for condemnation the following passage in an article of M. Nefftzer in the *Revue Germanique* for September, 1863:—"La négation du miracle n'est pas subordonnée à l'expérience; elle est une nécessité logique et un fait de certitude interne; elle doit être le premier article du *credo* de tout historien et de tout penseur."

"If it be true," he says, "that man has a sense given him to determine what is right and wrong, it follows that his moral judgments cannot be susceptible of any improvement." But surely a man may be endowed with a moral sense, and yet go astray in particulars, through ignorance, or adverse circumstances, or wilful disobedience. Mr. Mill does not deny the existence of man's bodily senses; yet they are all "susceptible of improvement." A trained ear detects discords in music which escape the uncultivated. It is well known, too, that the sense of touch in the blind is so quickened by exercise, as to enable them to distinguish colours. For the same reason, the painter's educated eye discovers countless gradations of tint and shade where the ordinary observer sees nothing but one uniform colour. As, then, man is born into the world with the sense of sight, but that sense requires to be duly exercised to enable it to distinguish the distance, relations, and proportions of external objects; so man is born with a moral sense, which is "susceptible of improvement" by right action. And as the fact of a man acquiring the habit of squinting, or seeing double through intemperance[5], or a blow on the head, is no proof that he never possessed what Aristotle calls the δύναμις of right vision; so neither do the aberrations of the will prove that man has not "a sense given him to determine what is right and wrong[6]."

The intellect also has its necessary truths. "It is a part of consciousness to which all experience bears witness, and which it

[5] See Reid, *On the Human Mind*, Sections xv. and xvi.

[6] Mr. Mill himself, when not engaged in defending a theory, insists as strongly as any one on the existence of a moral sense and an objective standard of morality. In his criticisms on Mr. Mansel's *Bampton Lectures* he observes as follows:—

"If a person is wiser and better than myself, not in some unknown and unknowable meaning of the terms, but in their human acceptations, I am ready to believe that what this person thinks may be true, and that what he does may be right, when, but for the opinion I have of him, I should think otherwise. *But this is because I believe that he and I have at bottom the same standard of truth and rule of right, and that he probably understands better than I the facts of the particular case.* If I thought it not improbable that his notion of right might be my notion of wrong, I should not defer to his judgment. In like manner, one who sincerely believes in an absolutely good ruler of the world, is not warranted in disbelieving any act ascribed to him, merely because the very small part of its circumstances which we can possibly know does not sufficiently justify it. But if what I am told respecting him is of a kind which no facts that can be supposed added to my knowledge could make me perceive to be right; if his alleged ways of dealing with the world are such as no imaginable hypothesis respecting things known to him and unknown to me, could make consistent with the goodness and wisdom which I mean when I use the terms, but are

is the duty of the philosopher to admit and account for, instead of disguising or mutilating it to suit the demands of a system, that there are certain truths which, when once acquired, no matter how, it is impossible by any effort of thought to conceive as reversed or reversible. Such, to take the simplest instances, are the truths of arithmetic and geometry. By no possible act of thought can we conceive that twice two can make any other number than four, or that two straight lines can enclose a space, or that the angles of a triangle can be greater or less than two right angles; nor yet can we conceive it possible that, by an exertion of Omnipotence, these facts can hereafter become other than they are, or that they are otherwise in any remote part of the universe[7]."

Mr. Mill, however, boldly contends, both in his *System of Logic*[8], and in his *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*[9], that mathematical axioms do not belong to the category of necessary truth, but are merely the result of experience; and he quotes with approbation the following passage from "*Essays*, By a Barrister:" —"Consider this case. There is a world in which, whenever two pairs of things are either placed in proximity, or are contem-

in direct contradiction to their signification; then, if the law of contradiction is a law of human thought, I cannot both believe these things, and believe that GOD is a good and wise being." *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, pp. 103, 104.

On the same page occurs one of the most defiant assertions of the absolute freedom of the human will which the history of speculation can furnish. Yet one of the most elaborate chapters in this very book is devoted to the denial of free will. The passage referred to is as follows:—

"If, instead of the 'glad tidings' that there exists a Being in whom all the excellencies, which the highest human mind can conceive, exist in a degree inconceivable to us, I am informed that the world is ruled by a Being whose attributes are infinite, but what they are we cannot learn, nor what are the principles of his government, except that 'the highest human morality which we are capable of conceiving' does not sanction them; convince me of it, and I will bear my fate as I may. But when I am told that I must believe this, and at the same time call this Being by the names which express and affirm the highest human morality, I say in plain terms that I will not. Whatever power such a Being may have over me, there is one thing which he shall not do: he shall not compel me to worship him. I will call no Being good, who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures; and if such a Being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go."

One must regret that Mr. Mill has here departed from the candid and dispassionate tone, which those who most differ from him will thankfully recognize as the general characteristic of his writings.

[7] *Metaphysics, or the Philosophy of Consciousness*, p. 248. By H. L. Mansel, B.D.

[8] Vol. i. p. 106, and following.

[9] Ch. vi.

plated together, a fifth thing is immediately created, and brought within the contemplation of the mind engaged in putting two and two together. This is surely neither inconceivable—for we can readily conceive the result by thinking of common puzzle tricks—nor can it be said to be beyond the power of Omnipotence. Yet in such a world surely two and two would make five. That is, the result to the mind of contemplating two two's would be to count five. This shows that it is not inconceivable that two and two might make five: but, on the other hand, it is perfectly easy to see why in this world we are absolutely certain that two and two make four. There is probably not an instant of our lives in which we are not experiencing the fact. We see it whenever we count four books, four tables or chairs, four men in the street, or the four corners of a paving-stone; and we feel more sure of it than of the rising of the sun to-morrow, because our experience upon the subject is so much wider, and applies to such an infinitely greater number of cases. Nor is it true that every one who has once been brought to see it is equally sure of it. A boy who has just learnt the multiplication table is pretty sure that twice two are four, but is often extremely doubtful whether seven times nine are sixty-three. If his teacher told him that twice two made five, his certainty would be greatly impaired.

"It would also be possible to put a case of a world in which two straight lines should be universally supposed to include a space. Imagine a man who had never had any experience of straight lines through the medium of any sense whatever, suddenly placed upon a railway stretching out on a perfectly straight line to an indefinite distance in each direction. He would see the rails, which would be the first straight lines he had ever seen, apparently meeting, or at least tending to meet at each horizon; and he would thus infer, in the absence of all other experience, that they actually did enclose a space, when produced far enough. Experience alone could undeceive him. A world in which every object was round, with the single exception of a straight, inaccessible railway, would be a world in which every one would believe that two straight lines enclosed a space. In such a world, therefore, the impossibility of conceiving that two straight lines can enclose a space would not exist."

But surely this argument is untenable. No one, to begin with, affirms that mathematical truths rise spontaneously in the mind; all we say is, that when they are fully brought home to the consciousness they remain there, and defy all efforts to dislodge them. When once the mind has grasped the idea, it recognizes it as an

immutable truth, and subsequent experience adds no force to that conviction. It may also be questioned whether we are incessantly going through the process of mental arithmetic which the "Barrister" supposes. When I see "four men in the street," I am not conscious to myself of always thinking of them as two and two, nor am I always adding up in pairs "the four corners of a paving-stone," nor did I ever, to the best of my recollection, really believe that two and two became five, by simple addition, in the hands of a conjurer. At all events, I am quite sure that seven nines in juxtaposition is a phenomenon which I have very seldom witnessed; and yet I feel as certain that the sum of seven nines is sixty-three as that two and two make four. On the other hand, the rising and setting of the sun is a fact attested by daily experience; and yet I feel no sort of certainty that the sun will rise to-morrow, nor can I recognize any law in my mind which would be contradicted or violated by its not doing so. I can easily conceive the present order of things brought to an end by the will of Omnipotence; but whether Omnipotence can make two and two five, or cause two straight lines to enclose a space, I am, at least, quite sure of this, that I find myself utterly unable to conceive the possibility of His doing so.

With regard to the "Barrister's" other illustration, it is a mere assumption to say that the inference, which the man in question would draw from the apparent approach towards each other of the two lines of a railway, would be, that two straight lines can enclose a space; his inference would probably be, that the two lines were not really straight. But, after all, that is not the question. The question is, whether he would not recognize the truth of the axiom as eternal and irreversible, the moment he recognized it at all; whether his conviction of its truth would not be as strong the day he made the discovery as it would be twenty years later. The "Barrister" evades the real point at issue.

So much, then, for "the necessary character of natural laws." That character does not belong to the laws of nature in any sense available for Professor Tyndall's argument. These laws did not always exist, they might have been otherwise, we have no reason to suppose that they all extend to other systems, and we have no assurance that they shall last beyond each passing moment. "I would first say," argues Professor Tyndall, "that when I affirm necessity, I merely affirm the result of knowledge and experience. Science shows that certain consequents follow certain antecedents with such undeviating uniformity, that the association between antecedent and consequent has become inseparable in thought.

We explain the known and predict the unknown on the assumption of this inseparability." (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 19, 1865.)

Very well; but in that case, as has been already observed, geology must be false when it tells us of several large breaks in the uniformity of nature. "The result of knowledge and experience," if it proves any thing at all, proves that "all things continue as they were from the beginning." Professor Tyndall must really understand that he cannot pick out just so much of an argument as suits his purpose; he must be prepared to accept all that follows from his premisses. Before the argument from experience can reach the doctrine of prayer, it must first run its head against the stone wall of geology.

And if the argument from "knowledge and experience" is thus impotent as regards the past, it has no meaning at all when applied to the future. We have no knowledge or experience of any event yet to come. My experience tells me that day and night have succeeded each other so far back as my memory can reach, but it tells me nothing as to the future; and my expectation that the future will be a repetition of the past is, as Professor Tyndall incidentally admits, "an assumption" which has no ground whatever in reason. It is an instinct which we share with the brutes, and which any idiot has in as great perfection as Professor Tyndall. There is nothing ratiocinative about it, and to use it as an argument is to appeal from our reasoning faculties to our animal instincts. (See Mozley's very able *Bampton Lectures;* Lect. ii. and notes.)

And here we might safely leave Professor Tyndall's argument, for it is built upon the sand; it assumes, as an axiom to start from, the very question in dispute—the "necessary character" of epidemic diseases. If the regular and established laws of nature are not, as we have seen, necessary, still less are those sporadic and irregular disturbances which breed the pestilence. But it may be as well to examine briefly the specific arguments which the Professor has adduced in support and illustration of his master fallacy. It may be said of them all, that they either miss, or beg, the point at issue.

He opens his attack with an *argumentum ad invidiam.* "You will, I think, admit," he says, in reply to an able article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Oct. 9, 1865, "that the value of this argument (in favour of the modification of natural laws by Divine interference) is not bounded by the limits of nineteenth-century Christendom; that it would apply equally well to the beliefs of ancient heathens or modern savages, who saw and see in almost every change of the aspects of nature the hand of an arbitrary

Deity." Professor Tyndall supplies, in this very passage, an answer to his own objection. The heathen was wrong because he mistook the character of GOD, not because he traced in the various operations of nature the action of His ever-present will. He believed that GOD was behind the veil of nature, working always, though his hand was hidden; and Christianity teaches the same doctrine, with this correction, that GOD is not "an *arbitrary* DEITY," but a righteous and loving FATHER, Whose "mercies are over all His works," and Whose ways are always "just and true," however crooked they may sometimes appear when seen through the refracting medium of our imperfect vision. "Whom, therefore, ye *ignorantly* worship," said the Apostle, "Him declare I unto you." And he preached to the mountaineers of Lycaonia the very doctrine which Professor Tyndall selects for condemnation: "Nevertheless He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with gladness." The very universality of the doctrine is, in fact, an argument in its favour. A belief entertained by the general conscience of mankind must have an element of truth in it: *vox humani generis vox veritatis*[1].

The gist of the Professor's remaining arguments is contained in the following statements:—"Once upon a time we prayed against the ravages of small-pox—with what effect? . . . Prayer, as a preventive or remedial agent, proved no match for vaccination." (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 12, 1865.)

"Would the suppliant voice of a whole nation have atoned for the bad engineering, or caused a suspension of the laws of hydraulic pressure, in the case of the Bradfield reservoir? I think not." (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 12, 1865.)

"I turn to the account of the Epping cholera case, and learn that the people drank poisoned water. To alter by prayer the consequences of this or any similar fact—to deprive, by petition, even a single molecule of miasmatic matter of its properties—would, in the eye of science, be as much a miracle as to make the sun and moon stand still. For one of these results neither of us would pray; on the same grounds I refuse to pray for either." (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Oct. 19, 1865.)

"They (ordinary Christians) ask for fair weather and for rain,

[1] "The general and perpetual voice of men is as the sentence of God Himself. For that which all men have at all times learned, Nature herself must needs have taught; and God being the Author of Nature, her voice is but His instrument. By her, from Him, we receive whatsoever in such sort we learn." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. I. viii. 3.

but they do not ask that water may run up-hill; while the man of science clearly sees that the granting of one petition would be just as much an infringement of the law of conservation (of energy) as the granting of the other[2]. Holding the law to be permanent, he prays for neither." (*Fortnightly Review*, Dec. 1.)

The objection from the Bradfield reservoir is altogether irrelevant, though Professor Tyndall repeats and dwells upon it. Is it really necessary to tell him that it does not belong to the conception of Christian prayer to ask GOD for any thing which man can do for himself? If I want a pair of shoes, and have no money to buy them, I work to get the money, and then I go to the shoemaker to supply my want. To ask GOD to work a miracle in order to supplement my indolence, would be the grossest folly and superstition. If the state of the reservoir had been known, there would have been no need of prayer, for a few men could have opposed a sufficient barrier to "the laws of hydraulic pressure." But in a case where man does his utmost, and yet remains helpless, where is the impropriety, philosophical or religious, in his crying for help to One mightier than himself? The Professor is guilty of a like impropriety as often as he consults his doctor. Take, for instance, the Epping cholera case. "To alter by prayer the consequences of this or any similar fact—to deprive, by petition, even a single molecule of miasmatic matter of its properties—would, in the eye of science, be as much a miracle as to make the

[2] "What is the primary cause of motion? Take, for example, a boy's ball, moving through the air under the impulse of a well-directed blow. . . . . It is perfectly true that the will does not create the motion. The ball is impelled by a portion of that energy in nature which man can neither increase nor diminish. But still the boy's will is the occasion of the motion. It has opened the channel through which the energy of nature has flowed to produce the specific result which the boy desired. So, in a thousand ways, man is able to come down, as it were, upon nature, and to introduce a new condition into the chain of causation. Place the point of contact as far back as you please, theorize about the subject as you may, the fact still remains the same. Our will does act on matter, and does act to produce most efficient results. Here is energy exerted, of whose cause we have the consciousness within ourselves, and, if the analogy is worth anything, it points to but one conclusion—namely, that motion is always the manifestation of will. As the boy's will acted on that atom of matter, which, though moved perhaps but a hair's breadth from its position, set in action—as if by the touch of a spring—the train of natural causes which gave motion to the ball, so we may suppose that the Divine will acts in nature. According to this view, the energy which sustains the universe is the will of God, and the law of conservation is only the manifestation of His immutable being—'the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.'" *Religion and Chemistry*, p. 340. By Professor J. P. Cooke.

sun and moon stand still." Under such circumstances, therefore, Professor Tyndall would "refuse to pray." No one, of course, has any right to criticize the Professor's habits of private devotion; but if he will parade them before the public as arguments against the devotions of other people, he must allow them to be tested by the rules of logic. Would he, then, in the event of an attack of cholera, seriously refuse to seek, "by petition," the aid of his doctor? Of course he would not. He would put more faith in the virtue of medicine than in the virtue of a syllogism; and he would be wise in so doing, albeit not very logical. But if he thinks it right and reasonable "to alter by prayer (to his doctor) the consequences" of imbibing poisonous matter, why should he speak with such scornful contempt of those who humbly believe that the Creator of the Universe can do at least as much as Dr. Brown or Dr. Smith can do? The Christian does not presume to dictate to Almighty GOD the *mode* of His healing operation. He simply believes that GOD *can* heal him, but does not seek to know how—whether by depriving poisonous matter of its properties, or otherwise.

So with regard to small-pox. The discovery of vaccination (itself, as has been suggested, possibly an answer to prayer) is no reason at all why we should cease to pray to GOD to avert the disease from us, or save us when attacked. To neglect vaccination, and still pray to GOD, would indeed be gross presumption; but to apply the remedy, and then ask GOD to save us, is surely the dictate of humble piety. Hezekiah prayed to be cured of a mortal disease; and GOD heard his prayer, and added fifteen years to his life. Nevertheless secondary means were prescribed as the necessary condition of recovery. "For Isaiah had said, Let them take a lump of figs, and lay it for a plaister upon the boil, and he shall recover." If Hezekiah had neglected the prescription, it is probable that his recovery would not have taken place. In like manner, I may pray "against the ravages of small-pox," and the doctor may prescribe vaccination; but the two things are not "matched" against each other. Vaccination does not possess a self-implanted virtue. It cannot act independently of GOD: it is but His mode of acting, the instrument by which, Himself invisible, He acts on the bodily constitution of man. It is, therefore, a strange way of reasoning which tells us that, because GOD has been graciously pleased to reveal to us a remedy against one of the scourges of our fallen nature, we ought therefore to forget the Giver in His gift, and "serve and worship the creature more than the Creator." He is the essential cause of the cure, whether it reaches us through the chain of inter-

mediate causation, or directly from Himself[3]. Well may we ask in the words of Hooker :—

"Is it for us to be made acquainted with the way He hath to bring His counsel and purposes about? GOD will not have great things brought to pass either altogether without means, or by those means altogether which are to our seeming probable and likely. Not without means, lest, under colour of repose in GOD, we should nourish at any time in ourselves idleness: not by the mere ability of means gathered together through our own providence, lest prevailing by helps which the common course of nature yieldeth, we should offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving for whatsoever prey we take to the nets which our fingers did weave; than which there cannot be to Him more intolerable injury offered." (*Works.* Vol. iii. p. 707. Keble's Edition.)

But, strange to say, Professor Tyndall's scepticism as to the efficacy of prayer "does not close his eyes to the fact, that while prayer is thus inoperative in external nature, it may react with beneficial power upon the human mind." (*Fortnightly Review,* December 1.) That is to say, we ought to pray to GOD, not because we believe that He can or will hear our prayers, but because this make-believe devotion, this "pious fraud," this lying superstition, "may react with beneficial power upon the human mind!" "And if our spiritual authorities," adds the

[3] "Instead of regarding the proper object of physical science as a search after essential causes, I believe it ought to be, and must be, a search after facts and relations; that although the word Cause may be used in a secondary and concrete sense, as meaning antecedent forces, yet in an abstract sense it is totally inapplicable: we cannot predicate of any physical agency that it is abstractedly the cause of another; and if, for the sake of convenience, the language of secondary causation be permissible, it should be only with reference to the special phenomena referred to, as it can never be generalized." "Abstract secondary causation does not exist." "The idea of abstract causation is inapplicable to physical production." *Correlation of Physical Forces,* by Grove, Fourth Edition, pp. 10, 11, 15, 198.

"An event which is possible in the way of nature, is certainly possible to Divine power without the sequence of natural cause and effect at all. A conflagration, to take a parallel, may be the work of an incendiary, or the result of a flash of lightning; nor would a jury think it safe to find a man guilty of arson, if a dangerous thunderstorm was raging at the very time when the fire broke out. In like manner, upon the hypothesis that a miraculous dispensation is in operation, a recovery from diseases to which medical science is equal, may nevertheless in matter of fact have taken place, not by natural means, but by a supernatural interposition. That the Lawgiver always acts through His own laws, is an assumption of which I never saw proof. In a given case, then, the possibility of assigning a human cause for an event does not, *ipso facto,* prove that it is not miraculous." Dr. Newman's *History of My Religious Opinions,* p. 303.

Professor, "could only devise a form in which the heart might express itself without putting the intellect to shame, they might utilize a power which they now waste; and make prayer, instead of a butt to the scorner, the potent inner supplement of a noble outward life." In a word, we are to "do evil, that good may come;" we are to indulge in a mendacious soliloquy as "the potent inner supplement of a noble outward life;" and this, in order that "the heart may express itself without putting the intellect to shame!"

II. The only other plausible objection against prayer is, that it implies change of mind and vacillation of purpose on the part of GOD. But those who urge it have committed themselves to a line of reasoning which will carry them much further than, probably, they intend to go. For the objection tells with even greater force against the creation of the world. When GOD became the Creator, He changed; He made an innovation on the previous state of things, and added to His perfections an attribute which, till then, had only a potential existence. Why did He make the world? Why did He break the silence of eternity with the sights and sounds of created life? To our finite faculties this seems a change of mind on the part of GOD; we cannot reconcile the creation of the world with *our* notion of His changelessness. Yet we do not doubt that there is a point where these two apparently contradictory truths meet in harmony, only that point is out of sight. We believe that the contradiction resides in man's imperfect vision, not in GOD'S ways, which are always harmonious and consistent, though "past finding out."

So with regard to the doctrine of prayer. No well-instructed Christian believes that his prayer can *change* the Divine mind. What he believes is, that prayer is one of the appointed means for bringing the human will within the attraction of GOD'S blessing. Take an illustration from nature. In the course of the year the sun, as seen by our eyes, passes through numberless changes. Now he "hideth away his face" behind a cloud, or below the horizon, and leaves us in cold and darkness; now he sends down warm rays which draw out with gentle force the hidden powers of nature in bud, and leaf, and blossom; now he "drieth up the water-springs," and turns a smiling garden into a desolate wilderness; now he "laveth the thirsty land," and with a golden harvest rewards the husbandman's toil. The exuberant beauty of tropical climates, the sandy wastes of the Sahara, the ice and snow of the Arctic regions, are all due to the varieties of solar radiation. Yet, after all, it is the earth which changes, not the

sun, whose influences are beneficent or hurtful, according to the nature and position of the soil on which they fall.

Now may we not believe that in some such way as this GOD may remain unchanged in His own essence and purpose, and yet that the intelligent fervent prayers of His creatures may be the means of bringing them within the attraction of His healing powers; while it is possible, on the other hand, that the neglect of prayer may be fatal to us, just as vegetation would perish on any spot of the earth which was never turned towards the sun? GOD'S gifts are blessings or curses, according to the state of the heart which receives them. His Sacraments are "a savour of life unto life," or "a savour of death unto death." His miracles harden the heart, or soften it. His presence, which is light and joy to His children, is "a consuming fire" to the sinner. This enables us to see the meaning of those passages of Holy Scripture which declare that, on man's repentance, GOD "turned away from His fierce anger," and "repented him of the evil" which He had proposed against him. Look, for example, at the doom pronounced on ancient Nineveh:—

"Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed GOD, and proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, from the greatest of them even to the least of them. For word came unto the King of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by the decree of the King and his nobles, saying, Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste anything: let them not feed, nor drink water: but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto GOD: yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell if GOD will turn and repent, and turn away from His fierce anger, that we perish not? And GOD saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and GOD repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not."

Who does not see that the change here, notwithstanding the dramatic style of the narrative, is all on the part of the Ninevites? GOD'S purpose remained unchanged. The Ninevites were going on a course which would have led to their destruction within a given time, and GOD, in His mercy, revealed to them their danger. They repented, they turned back from their evil way, and so escaped the judgment which hung menacingly in front of them. If I see a blind man walking in the direction of a precipice, and I call out to him, "Yet forty paces in that direction, and you will perish," and if he turn back and so avoid the danger—there is no change in my purpose, for my purpose was to save him by warning him of his danger. Now the moral world has its laws

no less than the material, and every violation of these entails its necessary punishment. GOD hath "no pleasure at all that the wicked should die," but rather that "he should return from his ways and live;" and therefore when He reveals to him the dread vision of the worm that never dies and the fire that cannot be quenched, it is in merciful warning that He does it, in order to save man from the hell which he is creating for himself in the anarchy of a ruined constitution, and the incurable paralysis of a perverted will.

The plain truth is, that the denial of the efficacy of prayer is a logical consequence of the rejection of the Sacramental system of the Church. That system is based on this fundamental principle of religion:—that all good things come from GOD, but indirectly and conditionally. I look abroad, and find two revelations of GOD's will—one in the material creation, the other in the inspired record of His dealings with mankind: and I see both characterized by one common feature, teaching this one lesson:—that it is GOD's pleasure to bestow all His blessings, not directly from on high, but indirectly and mediately—through material, through animal, through human and spiritual instruments. He arrays the lilies of the field with glory more than Solomon's; yet not immediately, but through the kindly influence of dews, and showers, and sunshine. It is He Who gives the increase in the harvest season, but not without the co-operation of the husbandman. The health of the body is from Him; nevertheless the sick man consults the physician, and submits to his treatment. He is the Source and Giver of all wisdom, yet we imbibe it from the lips and pens of human teachers. And when I raise my eyes from the physical to the spiritual creation, I behold the same law in operation. Under the Jewish economy I observe an elaborate ritual prescribed by GOD Himself as the condition on which man was to approach His Maker and receive His blessing. I see Naaman cleansed by the water of the Jordan, Job's friends pardoned by means of Job's intercession, Jeroboam's withered hand restored at the prayer of the Man of GOD from Judah, Elijah fed by the wild birds of the desert. Then in the fulness of time, when CHRIST appeared as the Head of the New Creation, I hear Him declare that He "came, not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it"—not to abolish the old order of things, but to give it a deeper meaning, and breathe into it a higher life. Thus He fulfilled in His own Person the requirements of the Law; and when He began to lay the foundation of that new dispensation into which the life of the old was to pass by a higher development, the rule of dispensing His gifts through the

ministry of secondary agencies is still observed. He established a Sacramental system, as the channel through which men were to receive the blessings which He purchased for them once for all by His suffering life and agonizing death; and He commissioned a regular order of men, possessing visible and tangible credentials, as "the ministers and stewards of His mysteries" "even unto the end of the world."

Those, then, who reject the Sacramental system, and claim the right of approaching, without the intervention of secondary agency, the throne of Him "Who dwelleth in the light that no man can approach unto," forget that the whole realm of creation, so far as we are acquainted with it, is one vast, impressive system of Sacramentalism. Human Science and Holy Scripture combine their voices in teaching us that beneath the world of sense there is a world of spirit—that what we see and touch is but the crust and shell, "the outward and visible sign" of a hidden essence, really present, though sense cannot apprehend it.

"Two worlds are ours, 'tis only sin
Forbids us to descry
The mystic heaven and earth within,
Clear as the sea and sky."

Or as Milton has expressed the same thought—

"What if earth
Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein
Each to other like, more than on earth is thought?"

The visible creation is a veil behind which the Creator, in His Church and outside of it, "worketh hitherto;" but it is a veil which conceals Him altogether from the impure and self-sufficient, and reveals Him to the pure in heart alone, and to them only "as in a glass darkly," though with the promise of a revelation "Face to face," when "the day breaks and the shadows flee away." "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with Whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." But if He has seen good to bestow His gifts in a certain way and through particular agents, have we a right to discard these, and to insist, like Naaman, "that He shall come out, and put His hand on the place," and so save us the trouble or the humiliation (as we ignorantly deem it), of taking upon us the "easy yoke" and "light burthen" of His service?

It may, however, be objected, that GOD has revealed His will

to us in the laws of Nature, and that those, therefore, who reject the doctrine of Prayer, act in strict conformity with the principle here laid down—namely, that our duty as Christians is to submit to GOD's will as manifested by His laws, and not to seek to change it by our feeble and ignorant impetrations. But this objection cannot influence any one who accepts the Bible as containing the clearest record which GOD has given us of His will; for that Book not only enforces the duty of prayer, but also gives us several instances of its prevailing power in the realm of nature. GOD has prescribed prayer as a general rule; but inasmuch as we are very liable to err, He does not promise always to hear our prayers. "If we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us" (1 S. John v. 14); not otherwise. Now it is quite possible that, in some particular case, even "the suppliant voice of a whole nation" may be not "according to GOD's will;" and then of course He will not hear us. But we cannot tell this beforehand; and therefore our plain duty is to pray, believing that GOD will not impute to us as an offence, but rather accept as the homage of filial piety, the petition of a devout and involuntary ignorance. All Christian prayer assumes, if it does not always express, entire resignation to GOD's will. Its perpetual model is that which was breathed through tears of blood in the garden of Gethsemane: "FATHER, *if it be possible*, let this cup pass from Me; nevertheless not My will, but Thine, be done." That saving clause, *if it be possible*, underlies every genuine Christian prayer. If we knew for certain that our prayers could have no possible influence in arresting the progress of a pestilence, it would indeed be both foolish and presumptuous to pray. But we do not know, and have no reason to believe, that there is any such impossibility. It has been shown already, that even the established laws of Nature, such as gravitation, have no inherent principle of immutable and necessary permanence. Nevertheless, the uniformity of their action for so long a time may be accepted as a sufficient indication of GOD's will that we should conform ourselves to them, rather than seek to change them.

And there is also this additional consideration, namely, that any change in the ordinary laws of Nature, while possibly benefiting one portion of the human race, might inflict great, and perhaps irreparable, injury on the rest. But neither of these objections applies to prayers for propitious weather nor for deliverance from disease. The changes of the weather are not governed by any uniform laws; I mean, the initial cause of the change does not seem to result from what is called a general law.

Even man can so manipulate the laws of nature, by agriculture and in other ways, as to produce changes in the weather, and even alter permanently the climate of a country; and a deeper insight into natural laws might enable him to do suddenly what he now accomplishes by slow and round-about processes. But there is good reason why this insight should not be vouchsafed to him in a world of error and sin. The present order of things would soon come to an end, if foolish and vindictive man could control the elements at his pleasure. So, too, with regard to disease. A poisonous miasma may travel with the breeze and breed a pestilence. But if man were more skilful in deciphering Nature's secrets, he might perchance change the direction of the plague-bearing breeze, and dissipate its poisonous freight in mid-air, or in the ocean. And, in matter of fact, many a locality has been delivered from the scourge of chronic disease by human skill and industry. Now, if man has thus an undoubted, though a limited, sway over the laws of Nature; if he can arrest or put to flight disease by purifying rivers, by draining pestilential marshes, and by other means; it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that an increase of knowledge would enable him to extend his power over maladies which now defy his skill[4]. But until that knowledge is vouchsafed to him, he surely shows his wisdom in appealing for help to Him in Whom he "lives, and moves, and has his being." If this be denied, it must be on one of two assumptions: either that there is no GOD—that is, no good and just Being Whose knowledge is unbounded, and Whose power is equal to His knowledge; or that GOD cannot hearken to the prayer of man without changing His mind, in other words, without ceasing to be GOD; for change of mind is a note of imperfection, and cannot, therefore, be predicated of GOD.

The first of these assumptions is, of course, based on Atheism; but Professor Tyndall and his friends do not profess to be Atheists, and it would, therefore, be manifestly unjust as well as uncharitable to make so odious a charge against them, however much their arguments may look that way; "this would be at once," to quote the language of the late Sir W. Hamilton, "an unmerited compliment to their reasoning, and an unmerited reproach to their faith" (*Metaph.* i. 32). With regard to the second assumption —namely, that prayer implies change of mind in GOD, enough

[4] Since writing the preceding pages, I have read Dr. Pusey's Sermon on *The Miracles of Prayer*, and it is a great satisfaction to me to find the general line of argument here urged confirmed by his high authority, as well as by that of Professor Mansel.

has been said above to show that this does not by any means follow. The objection is, in fact, a begging of the question.

The Christian doctrine of prayer, in relation to GOD's chastening judgments, may be thus expressed:—There is in fallen human nature a tendency, more or less strong, but present in every individual of the race, to forget GOD. Man is prone to be a slave to the material and the sensual. He finds it hard to realize his dependence from moment to moment on the sustaining power and loving care of an unseen Father. "Underneath him are the everlasting Arms;" but they are not of flesh and blood, and it requires a gift of second sight, or faith, to perceive them. Faith, then, is the faculty which enables us to "see Him Who is invisible." But it is a faculty which requires constant exercise, else it will grow dull, and so, incapable of looking through the veil of unsubstantial phenomena into the spiritual kingdom, with its "thrones, and principalities, and powers," which lies hidden behind it. In order, therefore, to quicken our faith, and help us to feel our need of Him for our daily bread, our life, and joy, He sends upon us His sore judgments, of famine, or war, or pestilence. He takes from us "the desire of our eyes," that in the utter helplessness of our desolation, our idols all shivered around us, we may turn to Him, and, like Job, acknowledge, "in dust and ashes," His sovereignty and His goodness. Granted (and this is our position) that temporal calamities are intended to produce in us habits of dependence and devotion, and that relief is conditional, as Holy Scripture testifies, on repentance and prayer, it is surely a strange objection to urge, that prayer implies change of mind on the part of GOD. As well might it be argued that a parent who inflicts punishment on a disobedient child, and removes the punishment when the child repents and sues for pardon, has changed his mind. The very intention of the chastisement was to induce a humble and dependent disposition, of which prayer is the articulate expression; and that being accomplished, the punishment is removed. Our duty, therefore, as children of GOD, is to pray to our "Father Which seeth in secret," and to pray all the more fervently in proportion as our distress seems unheeded, and our petitions seem scattered on the winds unheard. We may trust Him that in His own good time, which is sure to be the time best for us, He will hear our cry, though perhaps in a manner very different from our expectations. The children of Israel cried long and earnestly from their "house of bondage;" yet their prayers were seemingly of no avail. The GOD of their fathers had apparently become as deaf and pitiless as the silent Nile, which stifled in its cold embrace the dying cries

of their little ones. But, in spite of all appearances, their "groaning" was "not hid from" Him. "These things were noted in His book;" and when they were ripe for deliverance, a deliverer was sent to them. So it is now. He, Who "knoweth our necessities before we ask, and our ignorance in asking," has taught us that "men ought always to pray, and not to faint," though the prayer may seem to be unheeded, and the answer may be long deferred.

To conclude. The argument, which has been very imperfectly handled in the preceding pages, may be briefly stated as follows:—Nature is made up of a succession of spheres, in each of which we observe a law or power dominating over that which is below it—in other words, acting a supernatural part towards it. The law, which so exquisitely fashions the crystal in symmetrical proportions, is supernatural in relation to the law of gravity; its action in the sphere of gravitation is of the nature of a miracle. Plants, again, are supernatural, or miraculous, in the region of inorganic matter; so are animals in the region of vegetation, and different races of animals in relation to each other; and, last of all, man is supernatural over all that lies below him. In each of these cases, the action of the superior power is a miracle in the sphere of the lower. The worm that crawls along the ground acts miraculously towards the law of gravitation—that is to say, it introduces the action of a higher law counteracting that of the lower. On the other hand, man's power over the laws of nature surpasses that of the lower animals to an extent which to them is as miraculous as the miracles of Scripture are to us. May we not also say that the man of civilization and science can perform miracles in the presence of the savage? The wonders of steam and electricity are in the eyes of the latter as superhuman as the conversion of water into wine, or the sudden multiplication of a loaf of bread, would be to us.

Now the question is, whether the will of man is the highest factor in the chain of causation—the highest, that is, under GOD; for the argument of this Essay assumes, of course, the existence of GOD as an axiom to start from. As man occupies a supernatural position in relation to the spheres of being which are placed below him, and his action in them is miraculous, have we any reason to believe that there is a sphere above man, occupied by beings of subtler essence and higher intelligence than his own? The power of such beings would be as supernatural, from our point of vision, and their action as miraculous, as ours are from the stand-point of lower intelligences. Now, if we are to credit the teaching of

Revelation, we are surrounded with beings of this supernatural order. We are told of "the Prince of the power of the air," of "principalities and powers in heavenly places (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις)." We are warned that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against the spirits of evil in high places (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις)." And these spiritual beings are represented as divided into two opposing camps, the one serving GOD, and ministering to man; the other in rebellion against their Creator, and bent on accomplishing man's ruin. To these beings are ascribed, too, the various operations of nature;—the medicinal properties of certain waters, as in the pool of Bethesda; the eruption of volcanic fires, as in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah; the control of electricity in the lightning, as on Mount Sinai; the ruling of the winds, as in the Apocalypse; earthquakes, as at the Resurrection; the origin, direction, and cessation of pestilential diseases, as in the punishment of David for numbering the people.

These and similar operations are attributed in Holy Scripture to the agency of Angels. Just as man can control, within a limited sphere, the powers of nature—can discharge the electricity in the thunder-cloud, or make it the peaceful medium of converse with his fellow-men, so the Angels are represented as holding in their hands the secret springs of nature's powers, ready to combine and direct them according to the will of Him Whose ministers they are—now "passing over" the houses of the captive Hebrews, and "smiting all the first-born" of their oppressors; now causing a deadly sirocco to destroy the host of Sennacherib; now "restraining" the plague as it hung over Jerusalem.

Such is the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Church. Is there any thing in Science which militates against it? On the contrary, there is very much which harmonizes with it.

Science certainly does not prove the existence of Angels, but it has undoubtedly demonstrated the possibility of their existence and presence in the midst of us, without our knowing it. It has shown that the air around us may be musical with the melody of unearthly voices, and that angelic shapes may be passing to and fro among us, though we possess no faculties which can apprehend them. It is by means of light that we are enabled to perceive external objects. Now, what is light? According to the most approved theory, it is the undulatory motion either of subtile ether, or of ordinary matter: and the various colours of nature are but names which we give to different sensations caused by these waves breaking at regular intervals on the retina of the

eye. In receiving the sensation of red, 477 million millions of waves break on the retina every second, while the sensation of violet is caused by no fewer than 699 million millions of waves in a second. Of course, as the waves increase in rapidity they decrease in bulk, and *vice versâ*. The size, from crest to crest, of a wave of red light is $\frac{1}{39000}$ of an inch; a wave of violet light is much smaller. Waves above and below these are invisible; that is, they move too rapidly, or too slowly, to make any impression on the optic nerve. But the art of the photographer has revealed to us that waves of light which are far too small to give the sensation of violet colour, and to which, therefore, the eye is insensible, can leave their impressions on substances more sensitive than the optic nerve. And as "other substances, not commonly called photographic, are known to be affected by light, the list of which might be indefinitely extended, it becomes a curious object of contemplation to consider how far light is daily operating changes in ponderable matter—how far a force, for a long time recognized only in its visual effects, may be constantly producing changes in the earth and atmosphere, in addition to the changes it produces in organized structures, which are now beginning to be extensively studied. Thus, every portion of light may be supposed to write its own history by a change more or less permanent in ponderable matter[5]. . . . The conviction that the transient gleam leaves its permanent impress on the world's history, also leads the mind to ponder over the many possible agencies of which we of the present day may be as ignorant, as the ancients were of the chemical action of light." And thus, as the same author observes elsewhere, "myriads of organized beings may exist imperceptible to our vision, even if we were among them." (Grove *On the Correlation of Physical Forces*, pp. 151, 152. 161.)

It is the same with regard to sound. Notes above and below a certain ascertainable pitch are inaudible to the human ear; and thus "the song of Moses and the Lamb"—

> "That undisturbed song of pure concent,
> Aye sung before the sapphire-coloured throne[6],"

[5] The same may be said of sound, as Mr. Babbage has so ably and eloquently shown in his interesting discussion of the theory of Mechanical Reaction, in its bearing "on the permanent impression of our words and actions on the globe we inhabit." "The air," he says, "is one vast library, on whose pages are for ever written all that man has ever said, or woman whispered." Babbage's *Bridgewater Treatise*, ch. ix.

[6] Milton's Ode, "At a Solemn Music."

may be vibrating on the air around us, though we hear it not[7]. This may be illustrated by the anecdote related by Professor Tyndall himself, in his interesting book on the glaciers of the Alps: "I once crossed a Swiss mountain in company with a friend; a donkey was in advance of us, and the dull tramp of the animal was heard by my companion; but to me this sound was almost masked by the shrill chirruping of innumerable insects, which thronged the adjacent grass. My friend heard nothing of this; it lay quite beyond his range of hearing."

This may help us to understand how possible it is for persons in a state of spiritual elevation or psychical excitement, to be within reach of sights and sounds which make no impression, or only a vague and meaningless impression, on the many. The eyes of the Prophet's servant required to be supernaturally opened before he could see the Angelic hosts which guarded his master; and the vision which was vouchsafed to S. Stephen at his martyrdom was invisible to his persecutors. In like manner, the Angelic song which broke the silence of the midnight air at the SAVIOUR'S Nativity was heard by the Shepherds of Bethlehem alone. So the voice which spoke to our LORD from Heaven sounded like the inarticulate rumbling of thunder in the ears of those who were with Him. And though the travelling companions of S. Paul heard the sound of the voice which converted him, the Apostle gives us to understand that the waves of the sound were too fine to convey any articulate accents to their ears. And, to take a familiar instance, the story of Jessie Cameron hearing the music of the Highland regiments, which heralded the relief of Lucknow, long before it became audible to those around her, shows the possibility of a person, whose

[7] "There may be innumerable sounds in nature to which our ears are perfectly deaf, although they are the sweetest melody to more refined senses; nay more, the very air around us may be resounding with the hallelujahs of the heavenly host, when our dull ears hear nothing but the feeble accents of our broken prayers." *Religion and Chemistry*, p. 44. By Professor J. P. Cooke.

When we reflect "that there are waves of light and sound of which our dull senses take no cognizance, that there is a great difference even in human perceptivity, and that some men, more gifted than others, can see colours or hear sounds which are invisible or inaudible to the great bulk of mankind, you will appreciate how possible it is that there may be a world of spiritual existence around us—inhabiting this same globe, enjoying the same nature—of which we have no perception; that in fact the wonders of the New Jerusalem may be in our midst, and the songs of the Angelic hosts filling the air with their celestial harmony, although unheard and unseen by us." *Ibid.*, p. 107.

nervous system is in a state of abnormal tension, to be within the influence of impressions to which others are insensible. What shall we say, too, of the mysterious voices heard by travellers, the author of *Eothen* among the rest, in the silent solitude of the desert? Does not all this show that there are "more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy," and that we may be in the very midst of a spiritual world, albeit the grossness of our faculties hides it from our view[8]?

Assuming, then, as an hypothesis, which Science renders probable and Revelation exalts into a doctrine, that there is a sphere of spiritual beings above men, analogy would seem to require that such beings should be able to perform acts which in the region of human power would appear as miracles. A miracle is, in fact, an effect without an apparent cause; when the cause becomes known, we cease to regard the effect as a miracle. When, therefore, we call a miracle a suspension of natural law, the expression must be understood as meaning a relative, not an absolute suspension. The fire of Nebuchadnezzar's furnace departed not from the common law of burning because it refused to hurt the Three Children, for it destroyed their captors: the former were simply placed under the protection of another law, unknown to human skill, which shielded them from the power of the fire. We also give the name of miracle to an accelerated process of nature, or a result produced without the intervention of secondary causes. The conversion of water into wine we call a miracle; but we do not give that name to the formation of wine from the vine. In point of fact, however, the one is as great a miracle as the other. He Who made water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana performs the same miracle yearly among us, though by a more gradual process; and it is only its very commonness which hinders us from recognizing its miraculous character. The miracles of grace are reflected in the miracles of nature. GOD is the Author of both, and as He daily performs miracles in the sphere of man's rebellious will, so He does also in the passive realm of natural powers, either directly or through the ministry of Angels. Day by day He changes water into wine, wine into blood, blood into milk[9]. Surely then it is exceedingly presump-

[8] It is scarcely necessary to say that no countenance is here intended to be given to the charlatanry of so-called "Spiritualism." It is ever the lot of truth to be counterfeited by imposture.

[9] See Lange, *Life of Christ*, vol. ii. p. 107, who quotes the following apposite passage from S. Augustine:—*Ipse fecit vinum in nuptiis, qui omni anno hoc facit in vitibus. Illud autem non miramur, quia omni anno fit; assiduitate amisit admirationem.*

tuous, with our meagre and fragmentary knowledge of Nature, and standing as we do in the presence of a thousand miracles, to dogmatize, as Professor Tyndall has done, and prescribe bounds to the free omnipotence of the Creator—leaving Him the mere fictitious semblance of Sovereign power, inasmuch as He is supposed unable to cure a headache, or save the life of a cow, without the consent of a legislature of blind forces. According to Professor Tyndall, a member of the College of Physicians is more powerful and more merciful than GOD.

Let it be observed, in conclusion, that whatever difficulties the subject of Prayer may present to the speculative reason, it presents none to the practical faith of the Christian. He knows in Whom he has believed; and the experience which he has gained upon his knees before the Throne of Grace enables him to scatter to the winds all the rash theories of a "Science falsely so called." In the Incarnation of the SON of GOD he has a clearer revelation than Science can give him of the method of GOD's action in Creation; and in that revelation he beholds, on the one hand, Nature obsequious and docile in the presence of her Lord, and, on the other, GOD stooping down to grant the petitions of all who called upon Him in faith. The blind man by the wayside, the paralytic on his bed, the woman of an accursed race whose daughter was "grievously vexed with a devil," disciples in jeopardy on a stormy sea, the widow weeping by the bier of an only son, the sister at the grave of an only brother, all appeal to Him, and not in vain. With a touch or with a word He commands the laws of Nature, and they obey Him.

"O Thou that hearest the prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come."

MALCOLM MAC COLL.

Reasonable Limits of Lawful Ritualism.

The last quarter of a century may, not inaptly, be termed a period of concurrent Doctrinal and Ritualistic progression. Not, indeed, that the two subjects have all along kept an even pace; or that both have been so associated mentally, chronologically, and locally, as combinedly to correspond with that ancient test of Catholicity which requires that the point in dispute should "always, every where, and by all be received." In truth the latter five years of this period, that is since 1860, have witnessed such rapid advances in "Ritualism," (using the term here in its inexact but now current sense,) as to surprise alike those who, in various degrees, approve or disapprove the separate or combined movement itself. It need not, therefore, be wondered at that, having a (lesser) popular and a (greater) unpopular side, it has become a subject of considerable public importance, and is shown to be such by its discussion among persons and in journals not usually accustomed to pay much attention to what they profess to regard, or do regard, as trifling disputes on minor Ecclesiastical matters.

Under such circumstances it is not at all unnatural that two questions (among others) should now be prominently put forward, touching what are called "Innovations in the Church," and not untruly (though often harshly) so termed, seeing that they are in fact, rightly or wrongly, the introduction of much which is novel to the sight of habitual or occasional attendants at the Services of the Church of England; these two questions are, *First*—Can these things be right? *Secondly*—Where are they to stop?

Yet these inquiries are not new. They are but the (probably transient) repetition (perhaps in a somewhat louder, more general, and more determined tone) of what has all along been asked, though latterly in a voice so subdued as to betoken indifference, or hopelessness, or acquiescence. They were the questions asked when Ritualism had scarcely advanced beyond those Accessories of Divine Service which are known as the "Ornaments of the *Church*," or, where it did exceed them, had only aimed at the surplice in the pulpit, and a black stole instead, or to supply the lack of the broad black scarf which was, perhaps, the traditional

substitute for the ancient badge of deacon and of priest. Now that Ritualism has travelled further into its own more proper region of the "Ornaments of the *Minister*," and Ceremonial Usages, it has revived the interrogations which, apparently, had become content to receive no further replies than were furnished by the judicial decision of 1857, in the celebrated Church Ornament case, and by the steady progress which still continued to be made in the direction of those Ritual appliances which that Judgment sanctioned.

The temper in which these questions were formerly, and are now, asked, varies of course with the knowledge or the ignorance, the hopes or the fears, the inclinations or the aversions, the doubts or the beliefs, the patience or the intemperance, of those who make the inquiries. But of most, if not of all, it is probably true that they are more or less influenced, whether favourably or unfavourably, by the consideration that Ritualism is, or is believed to be, the outward and visible sign and expression of Doctrinal opinions which are explicitly or implicitly held by most, if not by all, of those who assist in or countenance its development.

It is the object of this Essay to endeavour to furnish a *sufficient* answer to both these questions. That the replies will *satisfactorily* cover the entire ground on which every earnest inquirer or sincere objector takes his stand, is an imagination so vain that, to allow it, would be the signal to desist from an attempt which could only be expected to end in failure.

I. The first question, then, to be considered, relates to—the *lawfulness* of the challenged Ritualism.

Now it is by this time widely known that the advocates of Ritualism claim as the general legal warrant for it the following Rubric, which is contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and which, by its opening words, seems to demand especial attention: —"*And here is to be noted, that such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of* England *by the Authority of Parliament, in the second year of the Reign of King* Edward *the Sixth.*"

This Rubric possesses the very highest Ecclesiastical and Civil authority which it could possibly have; for it is an integral part of the Prayer Book which, in the year 1662, after careful consideration, (*a*) received the sanction of the Convocation of both Provinces, and (*b*) became part of the Statute Law of the land by the Act of Parliament 13 and 14 Charles II., chap. 4;

and as it has not been repealed by any subsequent Act, it is to this day Legally and Ecclesiastically binding upon the whole Church of England.

At all times, then, it was of consequence for Churchmen, and especially for the Clergy, to know what this Rubric meant; but now it is still more important to understand it, seeing that in virtue of it the practices complained of have been commenced. Fortunately the same difficulties which beset its explanation nine years ago do not now exist, at least in a *legal* point of view. For on the 21st March, 1857, the highest existing Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical Causes, viz., the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, pronounced a Decision upon the meaning of the Rubric, and by that decision the Church of England and all her Officers and Courts are strictly bound, so long as the decision itself shall remain untouched by any further Judgment of the same Court, or by any joint proceeding of the Church and Realm modifying or reversing that decision. Persons who are competent to investigate the subject, are indeed at full liberty to question the soundness of the interpretation thus given, and to argue out any other theory of the meaning of the Rubric: but in practice all must abide by the decision of the Queen in Council, whether it be really right or wrong.

That Decision is contained in the following passage of the Judgment:—"The Rubric to the Prayer Book of January 1st, 1604, adopts the language of the Rubric of Elizabeth. The Rubric to the present Prayer Book adopts the language of the Statute of Elizabeth; but they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses, and the same utensils, or articles, which were used under the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth may still be used. None of them, therefore, can have any reference to articles not used in the services, but set up in Churches as ornaments, in the sense of decorations." (Moore's *Report, Liddell* v. *Westerton*, p. 159.)

The clear and precise language of this Decision distinctly settles two points as to the meaning of the present Rubric.

First—That the now lawful "Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration"—namely, "all the several articles used in the performance of the services and rites of the Church," as the Judicial Committee (quoting, at p. 156, the interpretation of "Ornamentum" given in Forcellini's *Dictionary*) explain "Ornaments" to mean—are *those* Ornaments which "were used *under*," i.e., in connexion with the Services provided in the Prayer Book of 1549.

Secondly—That "articles of decoration or embellishment"

(p. 156), employed "as Ornaments" of churches, but "not used in the Services," are not included in this Rubric: they stand upon an independent ground. Thus, to take the illustration and the words used by the Judicial Committee (p. 161), "crosses" so "set up" are "entirely unaffected by the Rubric. If crosses of the latter description were in use in the second year of Edward the Sixth, they derive no protection from the Rubric; if they were lawfully in use, they are not excluded by the Rubric, though they might not have the sanction of the authority of Parliament."

The meaning of the Rubric being thus Judicially pronounced, the next point to be determined is the mode of applying that meaning in practice; and here two difficulties present themselves. 1. How can it be ascertained *what* Ornaments "were used under" the Book of 1549? 2. May *all* the Ornaments "still be used" which "under" the Book of 1549 "were used"? In dealing with these two points the investigation may advantageously be limited to the "Ornaments," properly so called, for they are the things at present most in dispute, the decorations of churches being now but little called in question.

First, then, this difficulty has to be met—How can it be ascertained *what* Ornaments "were used under" the Book of 1549?

According to the opinion of some, this question can be at once answered, and in the simplest way possible. Thus Mr. Benjamin Shaw, in a temperate article in the *Contemporary Review* for January last, contends (p. 24) that the legal Ornaments of the second year of Edward VI. recognized in the Decision of the Judicial Committee are those, and those only, which are "*mentioned*" in the Prayer Book of 1549, and this to him "appears on all accounts to be the only satisfactory view; a rule," he says, "which permits of indefinite additions is, for practical purposes, little better than no rule at all." For this view he assigns four reasons:—

(1). The language of the Judicial Committee themselves, in another part of their Judgment (Moore, *Report*, p. 156), where they say "that the word 'Ornament' applies, and in this Rubric is confined to those articles the use of which in the Services and Ministrations of the Church is prescribed by the Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth."

But it is due to their Lordships, and to the gravity of the questions which they had to decide, to believe that they employed well-considered terms, and used them in no inexact sense: so that when speaking in one place of things "prescribed by," and in another, of things "used under" the Book of 1549, it ought

not to be assumed that in their minds these were simply identical and interchangeable terms. Indeed, though *both* terms were used with reference to the same Rubric, they do not both apply to the same portion of it. In speaking of what was "prescribed by," they were defining the word "Ornaments," in order to remove Dr. Lushington's difficulty as to the Rubric, viz., "that although there were words in that Prayer Book [i.e., of 1549] describing the ornaments of the Ministers, there were none which applied to ornaments of the Church, in his understanding of this expression." Accordingly they said that "*the word* 'Ornaments'" was limited to "those articles" so "prescribed" as they pointed out: they did not, at least in terms, say that *every other* ornament of this kind was *excluded* from "use" under the Book of 1549, unless it was *named* in that Book. Indeed, it is scarcely possible that they could have intended to say so; for their attention had been especially drawn to the fact that no linen cloth for the Altar is "prescribed" *nominatim* in the Book of 1549; yet it was an essential "Ornament," and unquestionably "used under" that Book, as, too, were Altar coverings or frontals, which nevertheless are not "prescribed" therein[1].

(2). A second reason given by Mr. Shaw is, that "in the Preface" to the Book of 1549 "it is said, 'Furthermore, by this order the curates shall need none other books for their public service but this Book and the Bible.'"

But the Preface is not treating of Ornaments at all, it does not make the slightest allusion to them, it simply relates to the old Services themselves, and this to show how they had been condensed and simplified in the one Book which collected them together. Therefore it was that thenceforth there would not be need for the *Legend*, the *Antiphonar*, the *Grail*, the *Troper*, the *Ordinal*, the *Missal*, the *Manual*—Books, these, which severally contained Lections, Invitatories, Offertories, Sequences, Rules

[1] An opinion of the present Attorney-General, published in the *Standard* of December 5, 1865, confirms the view here taken, viz., that an Ornament is not unlawful because it is not prescribed *nominatim* in the First Prayer Book:—"It is Sir Roundell Palmer's opinion that the use of the Stole, although it may not be expressly enjoined in Edward VI.'s first Prayer Book, is yet perfectly legal; and that, therefore, the use of it is at least optional, if not in strictness necessary.

"N.B.—The above applies to black stoles only, not to coloured ones.

"(Signed), ROUNDELL PALMER.

"Atwick, October 5th, 1865."

But it must be remarked that the old Stole never was *black* except on Funereal or some Penitential occasions.

for saying the Offices, the Altar Service, Rites, and kindred matters; but which neither contained detailed lists of Ornaments, nor even directions when to use them, except incidentally and similarly to directions occurring here and there in the current Rubrics of the present Prayer Book. In fact it is altogether a mistake, and one which has been fruitful of many errors, to suppose that the earlier Office and Service Books of the Church of England ever set out in any separate and formal way lists of Ornaments; so that the Book of 1549, with its bare, and, for the most part, casual mention of them, was arranged in this respect in conformity with the model furnished by the older Rituals.

(3). A third reason named by Mr. Shaw embraces three points of a similar character, viz. :—

(*a*). The provision of "one Use" in the First Prayer Book, because "heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm;" this being mentioned in the Preface, "Concerning the Service of the Church," which was inserted in the Book of 1549, and is still retained.

But this is wholly irrelevant to the subject of Ornaments. It relates entirely to the mode of reciting the Divine Offices, whether in monotone, i.e., "saying," or with inflexions, i.e., "singing;" and which had grown so varied and so elaborate as to be difficult in many cases to follow. In fact this was simply the continuation of a decision which had been made seven years before, March 3rd, 1541-2, in the Convocation of Canterbury, when "it was decreed that the Use and Custom of the Church of Sarum should be observed by all and singular clerics throughout the province of Canterbury, in saying their canonical hours." (*Wilkins's Conc.*, iii., 861-2). And, as it is certain that this rule of uniformity could not have been intended to prohibit "saying" or "singing" then, for they were the Sarum "Use and Custom;" so there is no room to doubt that they were not meant to be abolished in 1549, and moreover are retained to the present day, as the Rubrics testify. The simpler notation was directed in order to make the Services more congregational; the departure from this arrangement, if it is strictly a departure, is to be found in the florid and elaborate "Services" and "Anthems," of cathedrals and other churches, where music of a more modern date is often preferred to the older Ecclesiastical Plain Song and Chant, which, as a matter of fact, whether for the best or not, was chosen as the standard at the Reformation.

(*b*). The provisions of the successive Acts of Uniformity which require conformity to the prescribed "Order and form," and

forbid the using of "any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of mass," or other service; and this "to the intent that every person within this Realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in Public Worship, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, and the manner how, and by whom, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are and ought to be Made, Ordained, and Consecrated" (13 and 14 Charles II., ch. 4, § 2).

But this, again, is to rely upon an authority which is mainly if not wholly foreign to the matter in hand; and is also unobservant of the accurate and technical meaning of the terms used in these Statutes. "Order and Form" mean *arrangement* and *expression*: "Rite" and "Ceremony" mean Offices which in their nature are neither strictly *Sacraments* nor *Prayers*. The title of the Prayer Book shows this; it is called "The Book of Common Prayer and *administration* of the Sacraments, and *other* Rites and Ceremonies of the Church." Here, plainly, the word "administration" shows that "Rites and Ceremonies," like "Sacraments," are *Offices* to be performed rather than *Usages* accompanying their performance. The custom of "Creeping to the Cross," on Good Friday, for which an Office was provided in the old Missals, was a "Ceremony;" the Unction of the Sick in the Book of 1549 was a "Rite." The distinction cannot be so clearly made among the Offices of the present Prayer Book; but the Visitation of the Sick, and the Burial of the Dead, may perhaps be regarded as "Rites;" Churching and Commination as "Ceremonies[2]."

It is true that these terms were sometimes used in an inexact sense and interchangeably with Ritual and Ceremonial; it is also true that the latter were accompaniments of Rites and Ceremonies; and it seems, further, true to say that Ceremonies sometimes mean the mode of executing the Rite or Service itself; but the language of the Statutes is technical, and must be construed strictly. And thus when Mr. Shaw asks, "How would this intent [of the Statutes to procure uniformity] be effected, if Altar Lights were to be lighted at particular times, and other ceremonies performed of which there is no mention in the Rubric, and for which guidance must be sought in the ancient Service Books?" he appears not to consider that, as the Communion Service was called "The Mass," both in the Act which he cites (2 and 3 Edw. VI., c. 1) and in the Book of 1549

[2] For some evidence of the old meaning of "Rites" and "Ceremonies," see Cranmer's *Articles*, 1536; *Injunctions* of King Edward VI., 1547, No. 27; and his *Proclamation*, Feb. 6, 1547-8.

it would have been a conspicuous mark of nonconformity *not* to have had Altar Lights, though no Rubric of the First Prayer Book ordered them; for the Canon Law required them at Mass, and they had been constantly used therein up to the very day on which the New Prayer Book came into use.

And so, too, as regards the terms, "Order and Form" (the latter of which also occurs in the 2nd Article of the 36th Canon and is subscribed by the clergy), they are safeguards against *omissions in* or *substitutions for* the language and directions of the Services (such as were desired or attempted then by Roman or Genevan non-compliants) and which would thus mar or contradict the Doctrines which those Services were designed to embody.

In support of this opinion it may be useful to quote a passage in Mr. Stephens's *Ecclesiastical Statutes* (Vol. i. p. 365), where, in a Note upon the words, "any other rite," used in 1 Eliz., c. 2, § 4, he says:—"A person of the name of Flemming was indicted (1 Leon., 295; *vide* Godb, 119), upon this Statute, and punished according to it, because he had given the Sacrament of Baptism in a different form to that which is hereby prescribed. In *Rex* v. *Sparks* (3 Mod. 79), an indictment for using *alias preces* in the Church, and *alio modo*, seems to have been judged insufficient, because such prayers may be used, upon some extraordinary occasion, and so no crime: and it was said that the indictment ought to have alleged that the defendant used other forms and prayers, instead of those enjoined, which were neglected by him; 'for otherwise every parson may be indicted that useth prayers before his sermon, other than such which are required by the Book of Common Prayer.'"

This latter decision seems to be in conformity with the exception made in Sect. 7 of King Edward VI.'s First Act of Uniformity, to which Dr. Burn draws attention in his *Ecclesiastical Law* (Phillimore's Ed. vol. iii. p. 439), and which runs thus:—"Provided also, that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in Churches, Chapels, Oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalms or prayer taken out of the Bible, at any due time, not letting or omitting thereby the service, or any part thereof, mentioned in the said Book," i.e., of 1549; and this Act is one of "the several good Laws and Statutes of this Realm," which are continued "in force" by the last Act of Uniformity (1662), "for the establishing and confirming of" the present Book.

(*c*). The remaining point which Mr. Shaw relies upon in support of his third objection is—That when the Prayer Book of 1662 was published, "the ancient Service-books" from which

he says "guidance must be sought as to Altar lights . . . . and other ceremonies . . . . of which there is no mention in the rubric," were "not books in every one's hands, but were absolutely prohibited" by 1 James I., c. 25, § 48, which revived the 3 and 4 Edw. VI., c. 10.

But, granting this, the question under discussion is not as to the reintroduction of abolished "Ceremonies," technically so called, but as to the restoration of certain "Ornaments" and Usages *in connexion with* the present Services strictly adhered to. Therefore it may safely be affirmed, first, that these prohibited Books are not needed for this purpose; and secondly, that the ground of their prohibition in Edward VI.'s time was that soon after the Prayer Book of 1549 had come into use, "dyvers unquyette and evill disposed persons" had "noysed and bruted abrode, that they sholde have agayne their old Lattene Service, their conjured bredde and water, with such lyke vayne and superstitiouse ceremonies" (*Order in Council*, Dec. 25, 1549). If Altar Lights had been reckoned among such "ceremonies," here was a favourable opportunity of condemning them, especially as the Act was not limited to *Books* but included certain *Images*. The revival of the Act in James I.'s reign, seems simply due to certain precautions then deemed needful against "Popish Recusants," whose houses might be searched under an Act passed in the next year (3 James I., c. 5), "for Popish Bookes and Reliques of Popery."

This, surely, disposes of Mr. Shaw's remark, that "All directions as to certain ancient ceremonies, and as to the use of certain ancient ornaments, are 'left out' of the rubrics of our present Book, while at the same time the Acts are allowed to remain in force that render illegal the possession of the Books from which the appropriate directions might be obtained." Yet, it is really necessary to notice the seemingly strange oversight which renders Mr. Shaw's quotation of the words "left out" most misleading; for in the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church," they obviously refer to *nothing more* than the "uncertain stories and legends, with multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals" complained of; though, indeed, looking at the context of the words, it may well be contended that the remark is strictly limited to those "stories and legends" which had been "read" together with "the Holy Scriptures."

(4). A fourth reason which Mr. Shaw advances for his belief that only what is "mentioned" is allowed, is this—"that the public authorities in the reign of Edward VI. considered the

intentions of the Legislature to be, that no other ceremonies should be used than those mentioned in the Prayer Book then issued," a conclusion which he thinks may be fairly gathered from the Royal Proclamation or Injunctions of 1549, as cited (by him) in the *Contemporary Review*, p. 24. "These expressly enjoin upon the clergy 'to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the King's Book of Common Prayer,' and there seems no reason to doubt that they were put forth with a *bonâ fide* purpose of carrying out the new enactment as it was then understood" (*Ibid.*, p. 26).

But, unfortunately for Mr. Shaw's argument, the document upon which he relies is not trustworthy evidence. It does not even pretend to possess any *royal* authority, for it is merely called "Articles to be followed and observed according to the King's Majesty's Injunctions and proceedings." There is nothing whatever to indicate whence it is derived. Collier and Cardwell quote it from Burnet who takes it from "Johnson's MSS.;" these have recently been traced and examined by Mr. Pocock, the careful editor of the new edition of Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, who, however, could not find this document among them, and was unable to obtain any more information respecting it. The date assigned to them is purely conjectural, and certainly they furnish no internal proof whatever of having been published in 1549. On the contrary, such a supposition is at once negatived by the fact of Article IX. directing, "That no man maintain . . . oil, chrism, . . . or any other such abuses and superstitions, contrary to the King's Majesty's proceedings;" for "oil" and "chrism" were expressly appointed in the Offices for Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick, in the Prayer Book of 1549; and nothing could well be more improbable than that they should be forbidden within nine months of the publication of that book. Moreover, Ridley's *Injunctions* of 1550, though for the most part couched in the terms of these alleged Royal Injunctions of 1549, make no mention of "oil" and "chrism;" while, on the other hand, he adds a prohibition of "saying the *Agnus* before the Communion" (though the Book of 1549 orders it)—a most unaccountable (and surely unlawful) omission and addition if he was circulating in his diocese a document emanating from the Crown, and having the force of Law.

The utmost, then, which can be said for these "Articles" is, that they may have been the Injunctions of some other diocesan bishop; and it is at least as likely—indeed, much the more probable, seeing that the Bishop of London was Dean of the Province of Canterbury—that they were copied from Ridley, as

that he took them from some other source. The discrepancy above noticed, and also Ridley's fifth Injunction (which does not occur in the other document) on the substitution of tables for Altars, go far towards disproving any notion of a common origin; and if it is the case, as seems likely, that Ridley's is the older document, then these supposed Articles of 1549 must be considered as later by about a year than the date assumed for them.

Again, Mr. Shaw had previously argued (*Contemporary Review*, p. 23) that, subsequent to the publication of the Royal Injunctions of 1547, the royal authority to issue proclamations having the force of law was abolished. It is difficult therefore to see what authority could attach to this "Royal Proclamation" (as Mr. Shaw calls it, p. 24) of 1549. Yet, if it were only, as seems probable, a form of Episcopal Injunctions, then it is essential not to attach more importance to it than fairly belongs to such instruments generally. For, while even Royal Injunctions could not alter or supersede the law unless issued in virtue of some other law which gave them an equivalent force, at least for the time; Episcopal Injunctions were simply exercises of Ordinary jurisdiction, and were valueless as an *authority* if contrary to law—perhaps of doubtful force against long and general custom —though, indeed, much *power* was often exercised thereby. The Judicial Committee, referring to Ridley's directions about Altars, remarked that "This Injunction extended only to Ridley's own diocese, and probably had no binding force even there." (Moore's *Report*, p. 82.)

Having thus shown that an *exclusive* resort to the Rubrics of the Prayer Book of 1549 is an untenable mode of deciding what ornaments "were used under" that Book, it becomes necessary to ascertain whether there was any thing else to which recourse was then likely to be had by the clergy of that day in using the New Service Book.

Now, it must be borne in mind that the churches at this period were amply (many, it may be said, were superabundantly) supplied with ornaments of every kind suitable for Divine Service. The inventories of church goods made in and after 1552, hundreds of which remain to the present day in the Record Office, show what they were, even at a time when much of what existed in 1549 had been sold to pay current church expenses—some taken by the Crown to aid in sustaining Court charges, and not a little even embezzled.

Up to the day on which the New Prayer Book came into use the services continued to be conducted, generally, exactly as they

had been for many hundred years. Some few changes had, indeed, been made from time to time by provincial or diocesan councils, and even by royal injunctions, as in 1547. But so late as the 8th March, 1548, "The order of the Communion," then issued to provide for communicating the people in both kinds, expressly directed that this was to be done "without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order shall be provided); . . ." and no "other order" was "provided" until the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI. was published. So that the old Ornaments and the old Usages were necessarily continued under the New Service Book, unless in any particulars they were not usable, being unsuited to the altered Service, or having something else substituted for them in the Rubrics of the Book. For it is simply absurd to suppose that in beginning to use the New Prayer Book the clergy began to discontinue every Ornament and every Usage which was not written in that book; and this, too, in the entire absence of any direction to that effect. It is only necessary, by a slight effort of imagination, to place ourselves for the occasion in their position, and no doubt can seriously be entertained that we should without difficulty or hesitation have combined in our ministrations the accustomed Ceremonial and the revised Services.

It is natural, however, to inquire whether these accustomed Ornaments and Usages rested upon any authority at that time, or whether they were merely the gradual accumulation of things which had accidentally found their way among the religious observances of the people. Supposing they had been no more than this, the long custom would have conferred upon them a claim to be still observed, unless some new rule had been made for the express purpose of superseding them. But, in fact, they had become a positive law enacted by the joint sanction of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Rulers. At first, indeed, and for long, no such force attached to them. Some were coincident with, and consequent upon, the introduction of Christianity into the kingdom, and had their origin in early, or even in Apostolic, times; others were of later indigenous growth in the English Church, or were transplanted from other regions of the Catholic Church. In process of time they acquired local or general authority, being stamped with Ecclesiastical sanction in provincial or diocesan synods; so that in the course of the seven centuries from A.D. 740 to A.D. 1463 a large body of Canon Law had been gradually formed, which, besides its multiplicity of regulations touching the Church's Doctrine and Discipline, provided very abundant rules for the Ceremonial observances applicable to Divine worship.

(*a*). The Canon Law, as thus framed in the Church and received in the Realm, enunciated, both in general and specific language, what were to be accounted necessary and suitable Ornaments and Usages in Divine Service. Moreover, in order to secure their being provided, it expressly stated what the parishioners were to regard as obligatory upon them to furnish; and these laws of the Church could not safely be disregarded, for the temporal courts would probably have upheld and enforced them. But ultimately they gained a higher status, and acquired, with certain limitations, the actual authority of Statute Law; though, apparently, this was only intended as a temporary measure relative to them in their then condition; yet one probably necessary, owing to the changes which had lately been made in the relations of the Crown to the Papal authority, and the abolition of that jurisdiction which had been exercised through the Canon Law by the Roman Court.

The Statute 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19, A.D. 1533-4, recites that, "where[as] divers constitutions, ordinances, and canons, provincial or synodal, which heretofore have been enacted, and be thought not only to be much prejudicial to the King's prerogative royal, and repugnant to the laws and statutes of this realm, but also overmuch onerous to his highness and his subjects; the said clergy hath most humbly besought the King's Highness that the said constitutions and canons may be committed to the examination and judgment of his highness, and of two and thirty persons of the King's subjects, whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether House of the Parliament of the temporalty, and the other sixteen to be of the clergy of this realm; and all the said two and thirty persons to be chosen and appointed by the King's Majesty; and that such of the said constitutions and canons, as shall be thought and determined by the said two and thirty persons, or the more part of them, worthy to be abrogated and adnulled, shall be abolite, and made of no value accordingly; and such other of the same constitutions and canons, as by the said two and thirty, or the more part of them, shall be approved to stand with the laws of GOD, and consonant to the laws of this realm, shall stand in their full strength and power, the King's most royal assent first had and obtained to the same . . . ." (Stephens's *Eccl. Stat.* i. p. 150.)

Accordingly, "by reason of the shortness of time," power was given to the King to nominate this Commission "at his pleasure." By Sect. vii. it was "Provided also, that such canons, constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial, being already made, which be not contrariant or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and

customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the King's prerogative royal, shall now still be used and executed as they were afore the making of this Act, till such time as they be viewed, searched, or otherwise ordered and determined by the said two and thirty persons, or the more part of them, according to the tenour, form, and effect of this present Act." (*Ibid.*, p. 150.)

Two years later, another Act was passed, 27 Hen. VIII., c. 15, A.D. 1535-6, in consequence of the Commission not having been appointed. By it the same power was given to the Crown, although limited to three years after the end of that Parliament; a similar saving clause was made as to the existing Canons.

"Since the making of which Act," it was declared eight years afterwards by 35 Hen. VIII., c. 16, A.D. 1543-4, "divers urgent and great causes and matters have occurred and happened, whereby the said nomination and appointment of the said thirty-two persons by the King's Highness have been omitted" (Gibson ii. 989), therefore the King's power was extended "during his Highness's life;" and moreover the civil authority previously conferred upon the Canons was confirmed in even larger terms; for it was now enacted that, "till such time as the King's Majesty and the said thirty-two persons have accomplished and executed the effects and contents afore rehearsed and mentioned; that such canons, constitutions, ordinances, synodal or provincial, or other ecclesiastical laws or jurisdictions spiritual as be yet accustomed and used here in the Church of England, which necessarily and conveniently are requisite to be put in ure and execution for the time, not being repugnant, contrariant, or derogatory to the laws or statutes of the realm, nor to the prerogatives of the Royal Crown of the same or any of them, shall be occupied, exercised, and put in ure for the time, within this or any other the King's Majestie's dominions. And that the ministers and due executors of them shall not incur any damage or danger for the due exercising of the foresaid laws, so that by no colour or pretence of them or any of them, the minister put in ure any thing prejudicial or in contrary of the regal power or laws of this realm, any thing whatsoever to the contrary of this present Act notwithstanding." (*Ibid.* 989.)

Collier states (Pt. ii. b. 3, p. 204), that "the persons were nominated, the scheme drawn out, and the business brought to a conclusion. Cranmer waited on the King at Hampton Court, acquainted him that the draught [of a book ultimately entitled *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*] was finished, and wanted only his Highness's authority to make it law." But difficulties,

partly political, caused delay; and the subsequent death of the King hindered the completion of the plan. The powers given by the late Act were however revived or continued (whichever was strictly the case) "during three years" by the 3 and 4 Edw. VI., c. 11, A.D. 1549. But it is noticeable that it does not contain any clause giving authority to the existing canons during the proposed revision. No reason seems to be assigned for this. It may have been that the work having been so nearly completed in the previous reign, as apparently only to need the last touches and the Royal sanction, it was thought needless further to reinforce the provision of the last Act, which already had sanctioned the old canons, "till such time as the King's Majesty and the said thirty-two persons" had prepared and enacted new ones—for this has commonly been held to be the effect of the protecting clause. A Commission "was issued in October, 1551," some changes being made in its members the month following (Cardwell's *Doc. Ann.* i. 107); but the death of Edward defeated this fresh attempt, which seems only to have wanted the Royal assent to complete it.

Lest, however, any should think that this wish and attempt to revise the ancient Canons is so far a reason against desiring to regard that law as having "authority of Parliament," that it argues its being, in part at least, obnoxious both to clergy and people, it will be useful here to point out that the complaints made against it were obviously not complaints of such parts of it as relate to the subject here under discussion—at least, if so, it was to a very small extent. Neither the Rites of the Church, nor the Ornaments and Usages therein directed, were likely "to be much prejudicial to the King's prerogative royal," or "repugnant to the laws and statutes of this realm," or "overmuch onerous to his Highness and his subjects;" it was towards other portions of the Canonical Code that these objections were directed; such, namely, as, for various reasons, had become inconvenient in the general discipline of the Church, or involved obligations to the Roman Court which were inconsistent with the claims of the Church and Kingdom of England. Indeed, to have abolished those ancient canons which related to the modes of conducting Divine service, would have had this effect, among other serious inconveniences, that it would have released from their recognized duties those whom the Ecclesiastical Laws had made responsible for the maintenance of the Church and its Offices; and so, would have left no remedy where such negligence arose—a thing by no means unlikely to occur, seeing that previous contentions on the subject had led to the enactment of

some of these very Canons themselves. Thus, for instance, the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham, in 1281, and of Archbishop Winchelsey, in 1305, give precise directions touching the relative share of the incumbents and parishioners in furnishing the goods and ornaments belonging to the Church. These Constitutions form part of that collection of Canon Law which was made by William Lyndwood early in the fifteenth century, and which has continued to be the great text-book in the Ecclesiastical Courts. It will serve to illustrate these remarks, and will also exhibit the general Ecclesiastical Law which the framers of the First Prayer Book must have regarded as supplying well-known rules unaccustomed to be placed in the ordinary Rubrical directions of Liturgical Books, to mention here generally the nature of the provision for Divine Service embodied in those Old English Canons. By this it will be seen that we are not left without adequate information, and that by no means difficult of access, of the Ornaments and Usages which, it can hardly be questioned, would have been thought suitable by the Convocation which sanctioned the Prayer Book of 1549, to be employed in connexion with the Services therein prescribed.

Thus the following "*Ornaments of the Church*" are named:—Altar and its Frontal, White Linen Cloth and Corporal for the Altar, Paten and Chalice, Two Candlesticks, Font of Stone (or other sufficient material), with its cover, Censc-pot, Cross for processions, a lesser Cross for the dead, Bier, Rogation banners, Images, Principal Image in the Church of the Saint to whom the Church is dedicated, Bells and Ropes, Books, Lenten Veil.

Besides these, some others are mentioned which it is convenient to keep apart, because, though usable under the Book of 1549, certain changes in the subsequent books have, as will hereafter be seen, rendered them unnecessary; these are:—Pax or Osculatory, Pyx, Lanthorn and Bell for carrying the Sacrament to the sick, Candlestick for the Paschal Taper.

So, also, as to the "*Ornaments of the Minister*," these are ordered:—Amice, Albe and Girdle, Surplice, Stole, Maniple, Cloth (*Sudarium*) for wiping the fingers, &c. in the Celebration, Chasuble (or Principal Vestment), Silk Cope for Principal Festivals and two other Copes for presiding in the Choir at the same, Dalmatic for the Deacon (or Gospeller), Tunicle for the Subdeacon (or Epistoler).

All these Ornaments, both of the Church and the Minister, and the repairs of the same, together with the Elements for Communion—viz., Bread, Wine, and Water—being considered necessary for the proper performance of Divine Service, are required

to be provided by the *Parishioners*, according to their condition; so that they are to furnish the *best* (e.g., Gold or Silver Chalice and Paten) if possible, though inferior materials may be allowed where poverty hinders; this being, in fact, the principle which regulates the character of Ornaments in the Canons of 1603.

With regard to "other decent Ornaments" and Furniture, of which are specified, as belonging more particularly to Churches, "desks and benches," it is stated generally that these, and whatever is omitted as belonging to the parishioners' charge, "ought to be found by the Rectors or Vicars, according to the divers approved ordinations and constitutions."

These Canons, however, deal with much more, which at all times needs to be regulated if the Apostolic injunction, "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40) is to be observed. Thus they prescribe reverence, care, and diligence in saying Divine Offices and ministering the Holy Sacraments; regard for the Churches and all pertaining to them, especially the Font and the Altar, directing the Altar Vessels to be carefully cleansed after use, and even ordering the Altar Linen to be duly washed. So, too, special attention is required as to the quality and purity of the Elements for the Holy Communion, and freshness and cleanliness in the Water for Baptism; the place, time, and frequency of celebrating the Eucharist are defined; the considerations which are to guide the Priest as to Celebrating more than once in a day are mentioned. Among Usages connected with the Celebration, there is the order, "Let two candles, or one at least, be lighted at the time of High Mass." Stringent prohibitions are given of any *charge* for administering Sacraments and Sacramentals, and this upon the principle that "what is freely received be freely given."

Moreover, in order that these Canonical rules be not neglected, the same Canons further charge the Archdeacons and their Officials with the duty of seeing that what is requisite for the Church and its Services be duly provided and carefully preserved, in order that GOD'S Sanctuary may be reverenced and His Worship be devoutly regarded. Mr. Johnson, just one hundred years ago, in his well-known collection of these Canons, thus speaks of them, though he was very far indeed from being an admirer of them, for the most part:—"Though I may, perhaps, be thought to take a bold step in the next thing I have to say, yet I am confident that all who impartially read even the worst part of these Constitutions, beginning at Langton's, and ending at Chicheley's, will be ready to second me when I say, that whenever the good work of making a system

of ecclesiastical Canons is to be performed, there are a great many particulars even in these Constitutions which will well deserve a place in this (now supposed) system, and especially in the foregoing part of the work."—(*Preface*, Vol. i. p. 34, Oxford Ed., 1850.)

It has been the commonly received opinion that what is thus prescribed by the Ancient Canon Law of England has *all along* been legally "in use," if not at variance with later laws; as "having authority of Parliament" in virtue of the Statutes of Henry VIII., already referred to. Bp. Cosin[3] has so stated the case in his *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer;* Lord Hardwick[4] in Middleton *v.* Croft, gave it as a judicial opinion, which has since been generally accepted; Blackstone[5] says the same thing; Dr. Burn[6] uses similar language; Professor J. T. Graves (cited by Mr. A. J. Stephens, *Eccl. Stat.*, Vol. i. p. 566) sets out at some length the history of their acceptance; and lastly, Sir John Dodson[7], too, in the Appeal to the Arches Court, Liddell *v.*

[3] Speaking of the second year of King Edward VI., he refers to "those Ornaments of the Church which, by former laws, not then abrogated, were in use by virtue of the Statute 25 Hen. VIII., and for them the provincial constitutions are to be consulted, such as have not been repealed, standing then in the second year of King Edward VI., and being still in force by virtue of this Rubric and Act of Parliament."—*Notes, 3rd Series.* Works, Ang. Cath. Lib., Vol. v., p. 439.

[4] "It has been already proved that the received Canons bind the Laity; and this appears by our Statute Law, 25 Hen. VIII., c. 21, in the preamble, and 35 Hen. VIII., c. 16, which continues the force of Canons accustomed and used; and here rests the Ecclesiastical power."

[5] "At the dawn of the Reformation, in the reign of King Henry VIII., it was enacted in Parliament that a revision should be had of the Canon Law; and till such review should be made, all Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals Provincial being then already made, and not repugnant to the law of the land or the King's prerogative, should still be used and executed. And as no such review has yet been perfected, upon this Statute now depends the authority of the Canon Law in England."—*Commentaries*, Vol. i. p. 66. Kerr's Ed., 1862.

[6] "Concerning this whole body of the Canon Law, it is enacted by the Statute of the 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19, as followeth:—'That such canons,'" &c. (See *supra*, p. 458.)

[7] "It is well known that Henry the Eighth never exercised the powers conferred upon him by the Acts above mentioned, and as those powers were expressly limited to him for life, it has been strongly contended that upon the event of his death they became wholly and altogether inoperative. As regards the power to appoint Commissioners and so forth, there can be no doubt that the Statutes ceased to have effect; but it is by no means equally clear that the same temporary character is to be ascribed to the several clauses respecting Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and other Ecclesiastical laws, &c., and especially to the second clause of the 35th Henry the Eighth, which it

Westerton, &c., took the same view, though he noticed an objection which had been made to it, and which was afterwards raised by Mr. A. J. Stephens before the Judicial Committee, who, however, did not decide the question, though they made the following remark upon it, after complimenting Mr. Stephens for his argument:—"If it were necessary to determine this point, their Lordships think this argument might deserve serious consideration, although it is contrary to the general impression which has prevailed upon the subject. As, however, their Lordships entertain no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the words, 'authority of Parliament,' used in the Rubric, it is useless to enter further into the question." (*Moore*, p. 161.)

Thus the case stands at present, the old opinion still occupying the ground, but just inconveniently threatened, so that it is not absolutely stable in the face of a not wholly new argument, against which much might probably be said if the question came definitely before the Court of Final Appeal. It is worth remarking, however, that apparently the posture of affairs would have been strange if this ancient Ecclesiastical Law had been wholly devoid of civil sanction at that time. The Papal Supremacy had lately been abolished, which, at least, was practically coercive in respect of the Canon Law. But, in the absence of any substituted State recognition, delinquents must have been merely amenable to the Ordinary and Episcopal authority of the Dioceses who probably could not have enforced their decisions by any temporal penalties; and thus the Ecclesiastical Courts would have been in the awkward condition of adjudicating upon causes without power to give effect to their decrees if treated with contempt. It seems highly improbable that at a time when the Crown was claiming Appellate Jurisdiction in the last resort, it should have weakened the Ecclesiastical Law by making its efficiency dependent upon the accident of the Royal pleasure or longevity.

But it goes far towards removing doubts whether this body of Canon Laws had "Authority of Parliament" in 1549, to consider the fact that the 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8, A.D. 1554, *repealed* two of the sanctioning statutes of Henry VIII.; for the

is to be observed is an enacting clause, and not a mere proviso as in the former Act. The language of the sections to which I have adverted, scarcely, I think, warrants me in saying that at the death of Henry the Eighth and the accession of his son to the throne, there was no parliamentary authority for the use of any ornaments whatever in the Church, although there may be very great difficulty in ascertaining what particular ornaments had the sanction of that authority."—*Moore*, p. 90.

third Section repealed the 25 Hen. VIII., c. 19; and the fourth Section repealed the 27 Hen. VIII. c. 15; though it must be observed that no repeal is mentioned of the 35 Hen. VIII. c. 16: it does not appear why this Statute is not noticed, but possibly it was considered to have expired in consequence of the Commission having been appointed under it (see p. 459). If it be objected that the clause authorizing the Canons was not thus affected, and therefore the Act ought to have been repealed in common with the two previous Acts which contained the like authorization; it may fairly be answered, that while Mary and her advisers would probably have had a strong objection to the continuance of any power to revise Canons, supposed to be conferred by those Statutes, they would have thought it immaterial whether the Canon Law had or had not *Parliamentary* authority, seeing that, in their view, the restored Papal Supremacy was adequate to enforce it. Nevertheless, as the two earlier Statutes contained clauses against that Supremacy, that alone would have been a reason for repealing them. (*Stat. of the Realm*, iv. pt. 1, 247.)

Bishop Gibson, II. p. 988, thus cites the Act 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8:—"§ iv. An Act whereby the King should have power to nominate xxxii persons of his Clergy and Lay-fee, for the making of Ecclesiastical Laws,—shall henceforth be repealed, made frustrate, void, and of none effect." In the margin he puts "Repeal of the Act 27 Hen. VIII., c. 15."

Yet supposing it to be true that these Canons had no direct "Authority of Parliament" in the second year of Edw. VI., *in virtue of either of Henry VIII.'s three Revision Statutes*, it is worth considering whether they may not have had an *indirect* Authority of this kind conferred by the Prayer Book of 1549. For if that Book was not designed to be absolutely exclusive of every Ornament or Usage not expressly mentioned therein, but, on the contrary, was formed in view of the then prevalent Ceremonial, and was intended to incorporate its general and leading features, except where otherwise ordered in the Book; then, by implication, that Canon Law which undoubtedly had *Ecclesiastical* Authority was further protected and enforced by the continued use under the new Service Book (sanctioned as it was by Statute) of things which that Canon Law prescribed.

It has been already negatively argued (p. 449) that the Book of 1549 was not *exclusive* in what it directs to be done. But it may be *positively* contended that it was meant not so to be. The evidence will perhaps be considered slight; but where, from the nature of the case, little can be expected, that little becomes important. First, then, there is extant a Letter written on

April 26, 1549, by Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius, to the Ministers at Strasburg. In this Letter, after saying, "We yesterday waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, that most benevolent and kind father of the Churches and of godly men, who received and entertains us as brethren," they continue thus:—"The cause of religion, as far as appertains to the establishment of doctrines, and the definition of rites, is pretty near what could be wished [here they enlarge upon the need of a suitable ministry]. As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin we will send it to you. We hear that some concessions have been made both to a respect for antiquity and to the infirmity of the present age; such, for instance, as the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead, and the use of chrism; for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned CHRIST, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion, and that rather they may be won over. This circumstance, however, greatly refreshed us, that all the services in the churches are read and sung in the vernacular tongue, that the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught, and the Eucharist administered according to CHRIST'S ordinance, private masses having been abolished. . . . At Lambeth, from the house of the Archbishop of Canterbury, near London." (*Original Letters*, Parker Society, p. 535.)

The writers were on a visit to Cranmer at Lambeth, and state that, among other things, they hear that Vestments, Lights, Commemoration of the Dead, and Chrism, are to be retained in the new Service Book. That they were not misled on the subject is plain from the fact that the Book did in terms include three out of the four things, and therefore, to say the least, it is highly probable that it did not exclude the Lights, though it does not name them (any more than did the Missals); for it will hardly be contended that they were more obnoxious than the Vestments.

Next, there is in the Record Office a MS. Letter[8] from the Duke of Somerset to Cardinal Pole, dated June 4, 1549, and

[8] The writer of this Essay may perhaps be allowed to mention that he has printed a portion of this letter at p. 7 of *Some Historical Considerations relative to the Declaration on Kneeling*, &c. (Masters, 1863), otherwise he believes the letter had not been previously quoted; it is among the State papers, "Domestic., Edw. VI., Vol. vii."

replying to the Cardinal's Letters "of the Sixth of Maie." In it the Duke (after discussing some questions as to the relative claims and positions of England and the Roman See) informs the Cardinal, who was then at Rome, of the completion of the New Prayer Book, and tells him, "We have delivered to those which brought your Letters the Boke of Common Service, the same whereof heir before we have spoken, agreed on in the Parliament." He further invites his judgment upon it, expressing his belief that the Cardinal "shal be satisfied" if he should point out "eny faulte" in it; and concludes by inviting him to return to England, adding, "we are not in muche feare but that it may wel be if ye did se thinges here with your eyes, and conferred with learned men the reasons and causes of our doinges, the which now ye do not learn, but by report, which in tyme and distance encreaseth, and made of them which favoreth not the thing ys exaggerated to the worse; ye wold peradventure condiscend your self, and be in all poyntes satisfied, as at this present many both of busshops and other learned men be, which at the first did miche repyne, fare you well."

Now, surely if the Service of the Church was intended to be conducted strictly and exclusively according to the bare positive directions of the First Prayer Book, which was then coming into general use, it would have been the most extraordinary self-delusion on the part of the Duke of Somerset to suppose that the Cardinal could have been "satisfied" when he beheld the changes which must have plainly marked, e.g., the external character of the Eucharistic Service, if, as would have been the case, he witnessed an Altar denuded of its Cross and Lights, and Linen Cloth and Covering; saw no Incense accompanying the Eucharistic Sacrifice; to say nothing of the omission of various Ceremonies which he would deem important, if not essential, adjuncts even of a reformed Liturgy. So that the very fact of the Duke thus assuming the Cardinal's contentment with the changes, furnishes one of the strongest arguments which could well be drawn from the doctrine of probabilities in favour of there being at that time little discernible difference in the general features of a Eucharistic Celebration, whether under the Sarum Missal, or under the First Prayer Book of King Edward the Sixth. To be convinced that in the nature of the case things must have been so, it is only needful to divest our minds awhile of their usual associations of the present Prayer Book with the ordinary Eucharistic Service, and to place ourselves in spirit before the Altar of any English Church on the Feast of Pentecost, 1549.

Nor are we without evidence to show that imagination in this

instance would not be wholly deceptive; for John Hooper, writing to Henry Bullinger on December 27, 1549, from London, where, of course, changes would be the most rapid, says: "The Altars are here in many churches changed into tables. The public celebration of the LORD'S Supper is very far from the order and institution of our LORD. Although it is administered in both kinds, yet in some places the Supper is celebrated three times a day. Where they used heretofore to celebrate in the morning the *Mass* of the Apostles, they now have the *Communion* of the Apostles; where they had the *Mass* of the Blessed Virgin, they now have the Communion, which they call the *Communion* of the Virgin; where they had the principal, or high *Mass*, they now have, as they call it, the high *Communion*. They still retain their Vestments, and the Candles before the Altars; in the churches they always chant the *hours*, and other hymns relating to the LORD'S Supper, but in our own language. And that Popery may not be lost, the Mass-priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the Papacy. GOD knows to what perils and anxieties we are exposed by reason of men of this kind. . . ." (*Original Letters*, Parker Society, p. 71.) Such was the testimony of an eye-witness nearly seven months after the Prayer Book of 1549 had come into use throughout the Kingdom.

(*b*). There is, however, besides this Canon Law now discussed, another test of what Ornaments and Usages were employed under the Book of 1549; and that is the well-known Injunctions of 1547, issued by Edward VI. It would be tedious, and is here unnecessary, to consider the various arguments which have been used for and against their supposed Parliamentary authority. The more general opinion seems to be that at the time of their being made, they did possess such authority in virtue of the 31 Hen. VIII., c. 8, and 34 and 35 Hen. VIII., c. 23. Their object was to abolish certain practices which, on various grounds, were considered to be either inconvenient or objectionable; and also to authorize certain other things which were thought to be requisite. The effect of them was to maintain as they were, whatever Ornaments or Usages they did not prohibit. As the Judicial Committee remarked, "they left entirely untouched the Service of High Mass, and made no declaration as to the nature of the Sacrament then administered" (*Moore*, p. 166). Indeed the third is the often quoted one which, while ordering the removal of certain lights before Images and

Pictures, says that there shall be "but only two Lights upon the high Altar, before the Sacrament, which for the signification that CHRIST is the very true Light of the world, they shall suffer to remain still:" thus, in fact, confirming that Provincial Constitution of Archbishop Reynolds, in A.D. 1322, already quoted at p. 462.

But it has been argued by some that these Injunctions were not in force in 1549, owing to the repeal of the Statutes which gave effect to them. Mr. Shaw (p. 23) thus puts the objection:—"The injunctions were put forth in the summer of 1547, and in the ensuing winter was passed the statute 1 Edw. VI., c. 12, which repealed the Acts in question. . . . . Now it is a well-settled principle of law, that any obligation flowing from a Statute, either *immediately* or *mediately* (i.e., from some rule or order made in pursuance of powers granted by a Statute), becomes null and void as soon as the Statute is repealed." From this he argues that the Injunctions authorizing the two Lights became null and void, and consequently that they had no "Authority of Parliament" in 1549.

Assuming then, for a moment, the soundness of this argument, it nevertheless leaves the Canon Law just where it was; so that if the Canons had, as has been contended, Parliamentary authority, the Lights remained independently of the repealed Injunctions. Yet this is not all; a much more serious difficulty arises if the Injunctions ceased to have any authority at the end of 1547; for in that case it necessarily follows, on Mr. Shaw's own showing, that their abolitions and their provisions were alike "null and void;" so that it became lawful to do again what they had forbidden, and equally lawful to neglect what they commanded.

But it may well be questioned whether these Injunctions did lose their authority, although the Statutes which sanctioned them could no longer be employed for issuing any similar new Document. The Prayer Book of 1549 expressly recognizes them in a Rubric at the end of "The Communion," where it is ordered that "Upon Wednesdays and Fridays, the English Litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by the King's Majesty's Injunctions; or as is or shall be otherwise appointed by his highness." Perhaps it may be replied that the Rubric *revives* one Injunction, and even confers Parliamentary authority upon it (and upon what the King might hereafter do in this respect), because the Rubric itself has the force of a Statute; but that it does not necessarily imply a recognition of the other Injunctions. Yet assuming, though not

admitting, it to be so, another objection presents itself to the supposed repeal of the Injunctions, namely the (alleged) Royal Injunctions of 1549 and Bishop Ridley's Injunctions of 1550, both of which have been already noticed. Each of these directs the omission of certain things in "reading" the Injunctions of 1547: this surely proves that they were and were to be, read. But if they had become "null and void," it is strange that they should have continued to be read—still stranger that other Injunctions should be needed to do away with parts of what is declared to have already come to nought.

If, then, it may be permitted a non-legal person to express any opinion upon the question—whether the Ancient Canon Law and the Injunctions of 1547 formed part of the "Authority of Parliament" for Ornaments and Usages in 1549—the writer would express his conviction that no sufficient proof has yet been given of their not possessing it; and that, therefore, it is at least permissible to maintain that they probably did then possess it, and accordingly to refer to them as warranting the use, under the Prayer Book of 1549, of things which it did not *nominatim* prescribe.

Further, it may be confidently held that, as regards these Canons and Injunctions, it is practically quite immaterial whether the Rubrical expression, "Second year of the reign of King *Edward* the Sixth," means, as was commonly held, the second year after his Accession; or, as the Judicial Committee decided, the Prayer Book of 1549. For the Canons and Injunctions in question were either equally of Parliamentary Authority at both periods, or they had no such Authority at either time. Mr. Shaw has argued at some length in support of the view taken by the Judicial Committee; but though much might be said in reply, it is needless here to discuss the question, both for the reason above assigned, and because their Lordships having given their decision on the matter, there can be no appeal from it, except to themselves in some new suit. Yet it may be said, with all deference and respect to such a Court, that the facts and arguments[9] adduced by Counsel in support of the theory, that the Prayer Book was of the *third* and not of the second year of Edward the Sixth, do not seem to have been satisfactorily disposed of, and might with much force be urged again if the point shall ever be re-argued.

[9] The writer ventures to refer to his *Lawful Church Ornaments* (Masters, 1857), Advertisement and pp. 9—11, and elsewhere, as stating some of these.

The question as to the mode of ascertaining *what* Ornaments "were used under" the Book of 1549, being thus, as it is hoped, somewhat fully considered, another question naturally grows out of it and of the interpretation of the Rubric furnished by the Judicial Committee, namely this:—May *all* the Ornaments "still be used" legally, which "under" the Prayer Book of 1549 "were used"?

To this inquiry there is no difficulty, it would seem, in giving a plain and positive answer, namely—That the same things may be *legally* used now, provided only, *First*, that there have been no changes in the Services, subsequent to the Book of 1549, which have rendered any of them inapplicable; *Secondly*, that no alterations in the general Law of Ornaments in 1549 have abolished some or added others.

First. The limits of this Essay make it impossible to examine in detail every Ornament or Usage in order to determine how far it answers to these two tests[1]. Indeed, it is sufficient here to take one or two instances, as both illustrating the principle and suggesting the mode of applying it. Thus the Book of 1549, in the Office for the Baptism of Children, ordered (1) Exorcism by the Priest; (2) putting on the child "his white vesture, commonly called the Chrisom;" (3) the anointing of the infant upon the head. But these Ceremonies were subsequently omitted, and have not been since restored; consequently these Usages and the "Ornaments" employed, viz., the Chrisom and the Ampulla, are certainly needless, probably unlawful, even though directed in the Ancient Canons, which are held still to have the force of Statute Law; for the withdrawal of the *words* which accompanied the acts must be regarded as an *implicit* repeal of the Canons in these particulars. It may be remarked here that this argument does not necessarily apply to the mere omission of a *Rubric* which did or did not involve the use of prescribed language: e.g., the Second Book of Edward the Sixth omitted the Rubrics directing the Manual Acts in the Consecration of the Eucharist, but the words which had accompanied them in the First Book still remained; therefore it was probably quite lawful to continue the acts, and it is highly improbable that any but objectors discontinued them, not being told to do so. So, again, the Rubric of the First Book which ordered "a little pure and clear Water" to be added to the Wine for Consecration, was also omitted in the Second Book, apparently to satisfy objectors, Water not being an essential element. But it

[1] Full details may be found in *Lawful Church Ornaments.*

was not *forbidden*, here or elsewhere; and therefore probably was still a lawful custom, even though in this case there were no words to accompany it.

To take another instance somewhat different and of a really practical character. The First Book ordered Reservation "at the open Communion," when it was known that any sick person needed to be communicated. This provision has since been withdrawn, though it seems very doubtful whether the language of the Rubric, touching the disposal of what remains of the Sacrament, was designed to do more than secure a reverent consumption of It in the Service when not required for the Sick. It follows therefore, that the Pyx could only now be a lawful Ornament if Reservation for the Sick should be allowed; and indeed it well might be, as for other reasons so considering the great unseemliness—sometimes almost irreverence—which attends upon the Consecration of the Holy Sacrament in some of the miserable dwellings of the poor.

Here it will be convenient to reply to an objection made by Mr. Shaw, who, speaking of the Ancient Canonical Ornaments, says (p. 21): "Perhaps it may be replied that such Ornaments are sanctioned, except so far as set aside by more recent laws. But this is to destroy the whole force and simplicity of the argument, which owes its virtue to a strict and literal reading of the words, 'such as were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.' . . . To engraft on this any exception not found in it is fatal to the scheme. If one article be disallowed, why not another?"

But, partly, Mr. Shaw answers himself in the very next paragraph when he asks—"And, then, what is disallowance? The whole dispute is at once let in as to whether things not mentioned are thereby forbidden, or whether there must be any, and, if so, what express words of prohibition." Clearly this is and must be the case, as was shown in the instance of the absence of the Linen Cloth in the Book of 1549 (p. 450); and the Judicial Committee recognized the necessity as respects the present Rubric, though Mr. Shaw has not quoted their remark. For, while they said, "that in the performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies, ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed; that no omission and no addition can be permitted;" they went on to say, "but they are not prepared to hold that the use of all articles not expressly mentioned in the Rubric, although quite consistent with, and even subsidiary to, the Service, is forbidden." . . . (*Moore*, p. 187.)

No doubt, however, Mr. Shaw would say in reference to the Altar Lights, to which he was particularly referring, that they are *not* "consistent with . . . the Service." Indeed, he says, "For instance, in reference to the matter before us, the Mass is swept away." True, the *name* is gone; but the question must be asked—Is there any *essential* difference between the Communion Service, which was also called "The Mass," in the Book of 1549, and the Communion Service in our present Prayer Book? Unhesitatingly we answer that there is not, but that the Eucharistic Doctrine has been uniform and continuous in all the Reformed Prayer Books of the Church of England, commencing with that of 1549. It follows, therefore, that if the Altar Lights were lawfully used in the "Communion" or "Mass" of 1549 (and, as has been shown, it would have been accounted a very singular Mass without them), they are equally legal now. Proof of this uniformity of Doctrine is out of the question in this Essay[2], and the point must not here be prolonged, except to mention that what the Judicial Committee said on this subject must be read in the light of the fact that, somehow or other, they were so strangely misled by, at least, one piece of information, acquired after the Arguments in Court, as to assert in their judgment, and to argue therefrom, "that the Prayer for the Consecration of the Elements was omitted [in the Book of 1552], though in the present Prayer Book it is restored." They did, indeed, correct the error in Mr. Moore's authorized *Report* (p. 179); but the mischief was irreparable, as the judgment had been given.

Secondly. The other test of *legal* usage now, is the consideration whether there has been, and still continues, any *explicit legal* abolition of or addition to the lawful Ornaments of 1549.

The more common opinion of the Courts and of Lawyers probably cannot be better stated than in the words of Dr. Lushington (Westerton *v.* Liddell, *Moore*, p. 31):—"I am well aware of the irresistible argument that the last Statute of Uniformity, by referring to the First Book of Common Prayer of Edward the Sixth, excluded not only the Second Book of Common Prayer, but every thing else effected in the interval between 1549 and 1662, whether by Act of Parliament or by Canon, which could or might have altered what existed in 1549; and, consequently, I am equally well aware that nothing done from 1549 to 1662, however lawful during that period, has in itself force or binding

[2] The reader, who may wish to see the subject discussed at length, is referred to the writer's work on *Some Historical Considerations*, &c., Masters, 1863.

authority after the Statute of 1662 came into operation." Again (p. 45) :—"I wholly deny that the Statute of Edward the Sixth, passed in the second year of his reign, or the Statute of Uniformity, can be affected by non-usage. By the law of England, no Statute can fall into desuetude. It is true that a Statute may become obsolete in one sense—that is, not enforced. It is true that no call can be made on the Judges of the land to enforce it; that by common consent a Statute may lie dormant; but if once a Court is called upon to carry it into execution, it must do so. The case of wager of battle is all powerful to prove this proposition."

These principles will not, however, sustain the Injunctions of 1547 in any position of Parliamentary Authority now. For even if (as has been contended) they possessed it in Edward's Second Year, they followed the fate of similar Laws on Mary's Accession, and were not revived by Elizabeth except so far as they formed the basis of her own Injunctions. So that now they can only be regarded as an Historical Document which had Parliamentary Authority in 1549, though at this day it merely furnishes evidence of what it formerly abolished or prescribed.

But the case is different with the Ancient Canons, which have also been treated here as then possessing like authority; for, whether or not that opinion of them is reliable in respect of 1549, it seems to be allowed on all hands that the 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, having been revived by Eliz. c. 1, they possess now the full Parliamentary Authority assigned to them in 1533, unless they have been in any particulars modified by any later enactment of equivalent force. For the later Statute not only restores "all and every Branches, Words, and Sentences," in the former and some other Acts, but also expressly states that they shall be "taken to extend to your Highness, your Heirs and Successors, as fully and largely as ever the same Acts, or any of them, did extend to the said late King Henry the Eighth, your Highness's Father." Mr. Shaw (p. 11) thus expresses his opinion of the effect of this revival :—"Upon the whole, therefore, it is to be taken that the power to direct a revision of the ancient provincial Constitutions and Canons exists in the Sovereigns of the present day, though not exercised. And the proviso which sanctions their use until such revision be made, being also revived, they are maintained thereby, at this day, in a certain degree of force, subject to the qualifications which the Act lays down, and subject also to the effect of subsequent Acts in annulling or superseding them in any particular points."

It would appear, therefore, to be a most reasonable conclusion

that if, as seems to be the case, the Rubrics of the Prayer Book were not intended to, and do not absolutely forbid all Ornament and Ceremonial except such as they prescribe[3], then the Ancient Canons may be legitimately consulted for supplying what is subsidiary to, yet harmonious with, the structure of the Services, and tends to enhance their dignity and beauty, though not disguising the features they were meant to exhibit. Nor, surely, could any more suitable source be resorted to for this purpose than those Synodical decrees which, being framed in pursuance of the Church of England's inherent powers of Ecclesiastical Legislation, are in principle sanctioned by the language of the Thirty-fourth Article, which declares that, "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

Latterly much has been written and said for the purpose of proving that the Rubric of 1662 (notwithstanding the Interpretation of the Judicial Committee) must not be construed in the full, literal, and grammatical sense which has commonly been assigned to it; but must be held to be legally limited by various provisions or practices made or followed before and since its enactment. Most of these alleged limitations are not now asserted for the first time, nor have they been left unreplied to[4]. Yet, as the now somewhat vehement repetition of them implies that some persons consider them still unrefuted, it is necessary here to notice them, however briefly. The various (sometimes, indeed, contradictory) forms in which they have been presented, renders this process somewhat difficult; but the five following propositions will, it is thought, comprise all the objections, whether lately or previously made.

1st—That (*a*) the Act of Uniformity, 1662, confirms the three similar Acts of 1549, 1552, and 1559; that (*b*) the Act of 1559 sanctions the Ornaments of Edward's second year only, "until other order shall be therein taken" in the way described; that

[3] In *The Law Magazine and Law Review* for February, 1866, the following passage occurs in an Article on "Ritualism in its Legal Aspect:" the writer says (p. 229):—"It will thus be seen how difficult and delicate are the questions which have to be decided when the use of any thing beyond what the Prayer Book prescribes comes to be legally considered. They will remind common lawyers of the questions which have arisen as to how far the language used in agricultural leases excludes the custom of the country, although the rules which have been established in these cases are of a much more definite and precise nature than any that have been sanctioned by the Ecclesiastical Courts in the matters above mentioned."

[4] See, e. g., *Lawful Church Ornaments*, 204—10, and elsewhere.

(*c*) such Order was taken in the Advertisements of 1564-5, which were subsequently incorporated with the Canons of 1603-4, and that, consequently, "the use of the chasuble, albe, and tunicle is illegal" now, though they were prescribed in a Rubric of the Book of 1549 [5].

In reply to this, it might seem enough to say that objectors [6] to the Altar Lights and other things not *named* in the Book of 1549, nevertheless admit the lawfulness of the Vestments because they are there prescribed; but it appears preferable to deal directly with the points specially raised in this objection.

To the first point, then, (*a*) it is sufficient to say, that the 13 and 14 Charles II., c. 4, § 24, gives the reason for thus continuing "the several good laws and statutes of this realm, which have been formerly made, and are now in force, for the uniformity of prayer and administration of Sacraments;" and that reason is none other than "the establishing and confirming of the said Book" of 1662, and therefore only of what it orders and not of any thing which any former Book ordered, unless this Book recognized it.

To the second point (*b*) the answer is—that the Rubric on Ornaments in the Book of 1662, though copied from the Ornament clause of the Act of 1559 (except the words "at all times of their Ministration"), stops short of the limiting clause "until other order," &c., and therefore does not sanction the power therein given to the Crown. Indeed, partly it was impossible to do so, for the Ecclesiastical Commission had been abolished by the 16 [?-17] Charles I., c. 11, A.D. 1640; and it may well be

[5] Dr. Blakeney, *The Book of Common Prayer, its History, &c.*, 1865, p. 264, &c.; also Correspondence in the *Record*, Aug. to Oct., 1865; Dean of Ely's *Speech in Convocation*, Feb. 8, 1866.

[6] Thus Mr. Shaw says (p. 28): "It may be said, perhaps, that the application of this test [viz., the Book of 1549] gives us one or two Vestments for the Clergy which are not now commonly in use. If this be so, and if it be thought right to revive them, they will be revived, not because found in mediæval missals, but because thought worthy to be retained by our early reformers."

So, too, the author of "Ritualism in its Legal Aspect" (*Law Mag.*, Feb., 1866, p. 230), writes:—"The rubric of the first Prayer Book to which the existing Rubric refers us, is clear in prescribing certain habits for the Clergy during the ministration of the Communion, and these are not commonly used. If any one, therefore, entitled to do so, were to take proceedings against a clergyman for not using the prescribed habits, the law, we think, would not be doubtful, and we do not see how the Courts could well refuse to enforce it, however much they might be disinclined to adopt such a course. Non-usage, however long, and however general, would obviously be of little avail as an answer."

believed that, on many accounts, it was considered wisest not to entrust so important a matter merely to the Crown and the Metropolitan.

To the third point (*c*) it is needful to reply somewhat more fully. At the outset it should be noticed (though the objection does not mention it) that the *Advertisements* were not the first direction given as to Vestments after the Prayer Book of 1559 was issued: for the "Interpretations and further Considerations" of the Injunctions of 1559, published about March, 1561, had ordered "That there be used only but one apparel; as the Cope in the ministration of the LORD'S Supper, and the Surplice in all other ministrations." This shows that originally, and for nearly two years, no limitation of the Rubric was intended, as the Injunctions themselves did not refer to the Vestments, though they treated of various details which could not conveniently have been introduced among the Rubrics. The cause of this subsequent limitation does not appear; but, as Bishop Guest (when consulted by Cecil, before the making of the Rubric) had advised against even the Cope, and for the use of the surplice only in the Celebration of the Eucharist, it is highly probable that this was done by way of concession to him, and others who undoubtedly were still more opposed to the fuller Eucharistic Vestments.

The history of the period shows, however, that this concession did not satisfy what may be called the anti-ceremonial party of that day. But no further recognized change was attempted for the next four years. Yet, a Letter[7] from the Queen to Archbishop Parker, January 25, 1564-5, sums up that history so far as regards the effect produced upon the Public Service of the Church by the growing non-conformity; and fully accounts for the preparation of the Advertisements of that year, in which a still further limitation was made, namely, that the use of the Cope should be confined to the Cathedrals, and there only be used

[7] "We, to our no small grief and discomfort, do hear, that . . . for lack of regard given thereto in due time, by such superior and principal officers as you are, being the Primate and other the Bishops of your Province, . . . there is crept and brought into the Church . . . an open and manifest disorder and offence to the godly, wise, and obedient persons, by diversity of opinions, and specially in the external, decent, and lawful rites and ceremonies to be used in the churches;" . . . and the Letter goes on to say, "We . . . have certainly determined to have all such diversities, varieties, and novelties . . . as breed nothing but contention, offence, and breach of common charity, and are also against the laws, good usages, and ordinances of our realm, to be reformed and repressed and brought to one manner of uniformity through our whole realm and dominions." . . . (*Parker Correspondence*, p. 224.)

"in ministration of the Holy Communion," by "the principal minister, with gospeller and epistoler agreeably." (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 326.) Nor need it cause the least surprise that the Bishops should resort to this merely *minimum* enforcement of the much larger general Law still existing in the Rubric, when the Returns made to Secretary Cecil, in consequence of certain inquiries set on foot by the Archbishop upon receipt of the Queen's Letter, reveal, among many other "Varieties in the Service and Administration used," the following facts:—"Some say the Service and Prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; . . . some say with a Surplice, others without a Surplice; . . . some with chalice, . . . others with a common cup; . . . some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, some in a basin; some sign with the sign of the Cross, others sign not; some minister in a Surplice, others without." . . . (Strype's *Parker*, p. 152.)

It is asserted, however, that these Advertisements, being a legal exercise of the power given to the Queen to take "other order" touching the Ornaments authorized by the Rubric and Statute of 1559, were a formal, and, in effect, a Parliamentary abolition of all the Vestments save those which the Advertisements order to be used. But (not to go here into the disputed question whether the Advertisements, even after the long delay in publishing them, were issued in conformity with the Statute —a point denied by many legal and other authorities[8]) it seems a singular estimate of the intentions and wishes of Archbishop Parker and his Episcopal colleagues to conclude that they *purposed* to repeal the Law when resorting in an extremity to a particular provision of that Law, with a view to retain in use just so few of the Ornaments, which that Law authorized, as they deemed it barely possible to enforce in the adverse circumstances by which they were surrounded. That the Law was not then held to have been repealed, seems plain from the fact that in 1563 it was proposed by some of the anti-ceremonialists to move "in the next Parliament and Synod," "that the use of *Vestments*," as well as "Copes and Surplices, be from henceforth taken away." (Cardwell's *Synodalia*, ii. 498.)

It is, moreover, further urged—that these Advertisements (whether fully possessing or not the Statutable authority claimed

[8] Mr. Stephens (*Eccl. Stat.*, i. 370) "Which other order (at least in the method prescribed by this Act) was never made; and therefore, legally, the Ornaments of Ministers in performing Divine Service are the same now as they were in the 2nd of Edward VI." See also Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 322; Strype's *Parker*, 158; Collier, ii. 495.

for them) were recognized in the 24th Canon of 1603-4, as "published" in the 7th of Elizabeth, and that the same Canon enforces their order as to the limitation of the use of the Cope to Cathedrals; and that this, at all events, narrows the directions of the Rubric, because the Canons clearly received the Royal assent.

But here, again, the fact of the state of the times afresh presents itself as an interpretation no less than a cause of legislation. This same difficulty still prevailed—aggravated too, by the evil of its long continuance. It will not be pretended that the disposition to use the Rubrical Ornaments of Edward's second year was greater in 1603 than it had been in 1564. It was doubtless all that could be done to gather up those existing fragmentary observances which were based upon the Ecclesiastical Laws, and to secure, if possible, their continuance by inserting them in a body of Canons, which apparently aimed at nothing more than the retention and use of what was considered *essential* for the decent performance of Divine Service, and the maintenance of *indispensable* Church Discipline. The presentation of the Millennary Petition to James the First, containing as it did, among other things, the demand that the Surplice should not be urged, must surely have satisfied the Bishops of two things, namely, that not to insist upon so much as the Advertisements required would infallibly tend to drag down the externals of the Church Service to the level of the Presbyterian platform; and that to attempt to enforce any fuller observance of the larger requirements of the Rubric might even be fatal to the maintenance of the then minimum legal demands upon the obedience of the unwilling conformists or determined non-conformists.

It may be a convenient test of the real effect of these Canons upon the Rubric, to consider what would have been the probable position of a parish *requiring* at that time that the full Rubric should be obeyed, and moreover, *providing* the Vestments with a view to its obedience. The Canons being only *Ecclesiastically* binding upon them, while the Rubric was *Legally* so, it may well be doubted whether an Ecclesiastical Court could have refused their claim, especially as it is observable that the 58th Canon, although saying that "Every Minister saying the Public Prayers, or ministering the Sacraments, or other Rites of the Church, *shall* wear a decent and comely Surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the Parish," does not *forbid* him to wear any thing else. It insists upon what it considered needful, because many wished to omit it. It does not inhibit what would have been supplemental, though probably few desired it.

But even if it were so, that the Advertisements and Canons had this alleged effect of legally limiting the Rubric—the re-enactment of the latter in 1662 destroys, it is contended, any force which they possessed at that time, wherever it opposes the Rubric; and this because the Rubric is now both the *later* law and has the twofold authority (which the Canons do not possess) of Convocation and Parliament. Though, however, this has been (as already pointed out, p. 463) the commonly received legal view, it is objected :—

2ndly—That "our Law of Ritual, as to Ornaments, is King Edward VI.'s First Book, as *construed with* and *expounded by the practice* of Archbishop Sheldon, and Bishop Cosin and others, who adopted that law at the review of the Prayer Book; which practice has been continued without interruption for two centuries to the present day [9]."

In illustration of the *practice* of these two Prelates, Cosin's Visitation Articles of 1662 are quoted, in which he only inquires for *Surplice, Hood,* or *Tippet* (*Works,* iv. 508, Oxford Ed.) ; and Sheldon's Letter of 1670 (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* ii. 329), in which he directs that the clergy "ever make use of, and wear their priestly habit, the Surplice and Hood." Hence the objector concludes that not even the Cope ordered by the Canons is to be added to the Vestments mentioned by Sheldon and Cosin [1].

But, while there is no difficulty in understanding that these (and other) Bishops were simply compelled by the circumstances of their times to abstain from requiring more than the Surplice and Hood, which they found it no easy thing to enforce in some cases, it seems impossible to admit the theory that this was their construction of the Rubric. It is easy and reasonable to believe that they hoped for gradual improvements under the re-enacted Rubric. It is improbable and unaccountable that, after discussion upon it with objectors at the Savoy Conference, they should have deliberately rehabilitated it by putting it into the language of the Elizabethan Statute, if all the while they intended it not to mean what the Presbyterians alleged, and the Bishops did not deny, that it did mean. The former said, "Forasmuch as this Rubric seemeth to bring back the Cope, Alb, &c., and other

[9] Archdeacon Wordsworth, Letter in the *Guardian,* Feb. 28, 1866, and *Speech in Convocation,* Feb. 9, 1866.

[1] Mr. A. J. Stephens (*Book of Common Prayer,* A.D. 1849, i. 368), says, in reply to Bishop Mant :—"The irresistible answer to Bishop Mant's argument is this, that neither the 'governors in the Church,' nor 'usage,' can supersede the positive enactments of the Statute."

Vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edw. VI., and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our 18th general exception, we desire that it may be wholly left out." To this the Bishops answered, "For the reasons given in our answer[2] to the 18th general, whither you refer us, we think it fit that the Rubric continue as it is." (Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 314 and 351.)

Further, this seeming desire to get rid of the received literal meaning of the Rubric has taken another form. It is said:—

3rdly. That "the words '*retained* and' before 'be in use,' limit the Rubric [of 1662] to such of the habits authorized by the Rubrics of 1549 as were actually in use in 1662, under the Rubric of 1559, as modified by the Advertisements of 1564 (which Rubric was retained in the Prayer Book of 1604) and the 58th Canon of 1604; . . ." and that "whereas the corresponding Rubric of 1559 . . . distinctly revived the use of the Rubrics of 1549 (subject to certain contingent modifications) 'at the time of the *Communion, and* at all *other* times of ministration,' so the revised form of it, as authorized in 1662, uses the one single term, 'at all times of their ministration,' thus suggesting one uniform habit, . . . viz., the Surplice of the 58th Canon, the use of hoods being also allowable under *this* view of the case[3]."

The objection is complicated, and looks somewhat formidable at first, but is not very difficult to answer. In part this has been done in dealing with the second objection, for it assumes an intention on the part of the Revisers which, so far from having any proof to countenance it, appears to be at variance with what can be gathered of their purpose. But the words, "retained and be in use," being the words of the Elizabethan Act, must have meant the same as the words "shall use" in the Elizabethan Rubric. Moreover, it has been already shown (p. 477) that for two years the Rubric was not in any way

[2] This "answer" of the Bishops is as follows:—"Prop. 18, § i. We now come to the main and principal demand, as is pretended, viz., the abolishing the laws whch impose any ceremonies, especially three, the Surplice, the sign of the Cross, and Kneeling. These are the yoke which, if removed, there might be peace. It is to be suspected, and there is reason for it from their own words, that somewhat else pinches, and that if these ceremonies were laid aside, and these or any other prayers strictly enjoined without them, it would be deemed a burden intolerable. It seems so by No. 7, where they desire that when the Liturgy is altered, according to the rest of their proposals, the minister may have liberty to add and leave out what he pleases. . . ." Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 345.

[3] Published *Letter* of Rev. C. H. Davis, Nailsworth, 18th Nov. 1865.

"modified;" therefore, during that time at least, the word "retained" must have meant *retained under the Book of* 1549[4]. Why should it be supposed that the Revisers were thinking of what the Act meant in 1561 or 1564, rather than of what it meant when it was passed in 1559? There is strong presumptive evidence that the language of the Act (without the limiting power) was designedly substituted by Bishop Cosin[5] in 1662 for the previous form of the Rubric; there seems nothing whatever to give the slightest intimation that that same Bishop, who had again and again contended for the full Ornaments[6], and even

[4] " . . . . it is obvious that there is no legal authority for the use of any ornaments of the Church and the Minister, different from those which are sanctioned by the 2 & 3 Edw. VI., c. 1. The meaning of the Rubric is, not that such Ornaments shall be retained, and be in use, as were in the Church of England in the Second Year of Edward VI., but such as were sanctioned by the Act passed in the second year of that reign." (*Law Mag.*, Feb. 1866, p. 226.) Yet (see p. 450), it seems certain that the Act must have "sanctioned" more than the mere Rubrics of the Book of 1549 mentioned.

[5] In a Prayer Book of 1619 (now in the Cosin Library at Durham, D. III.), Cosin had made Marginal Notes (in his own handwriting), designed, it can hardly be doubted, for the 1661 Revision. The following is his emendation of the Rubric:—" ∴ Such ornaments of the Church, & of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration shal be retayned & be in use, as were in this Church of England by the Authority of Parliament in the Second year of y^e^ Reign of K. Edw. vi." Underneath he had written, "*These are y^e^ words of y^e^ Act itself v Supra.*"

[6] See the following *Notes on the Common Prayer.—Cosin's Works* (Ang. Cath. Lib.) Vol. v.

FIRST SERIES, written probably between 1619 and 1638, p. 42. "*As were in use.* And then were in use, not a surplice and hood, as we now use, but a plain white alb, with a vestment or cope over it; and therefore, according to this Rubric, are we still bound to wear albs and vestments, as have been so long time worn in the Church of God, howsoever it is neglected. For the disuse of these ornaments, we may thank them that came from Geneva, and in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, being set in places of government, suffered every negligent priest to do what him listed, so he would but profess a difference and opposition in all things (though never so lawful otherwise) against the Church of Rome, and the Ceremonies therein used. If any man shall answer, that now the 58th Canon hath appointed it otherwise, and that these things are alterable by the direction of the Church wherein we live, I answer that such matters are to be altered by the same authority wherewith they were established, and that if that authority be the Convocation of the Clergy, as I think it is (only that), that the 14th Canon commands us to observe all the Ceremonies prescribed in this book, I would fain know how we should observe both Canons. (But the Act of Parliament, I see, refers to the Canon, and until such time as other order shall be taken.)"

The Editor of this Oxford Edition of Bishop Cosin's Works mentions that "the words in parenthesis were added at a later time." And it is well to notice here that Cosin has made a curious mistake, if by "the Canon" he is, as he seems to be, referring here to any Canon of 1603; for the Elizabethan

said that they ought to be "particularly named" in the Rubric[7], had in the least changed his mind about them, and would not have been glad to witness a revived use of them, such as at the present time has been commenced.

Act was long prior to the Canon. If it should be thought that this addition was made after 1662, then there is this difficulty, that the Statute of Uniformity of that year does not mention the "other order" which Cosin notices as being in "the Act." This consideration seems to meet Mr. Milton's remark (Letter in the *Guardian*, Feb. 14, 1866), that "It is this 'other order taken' which makes Canon 58 the one law of the Church on the matter, and so removed his [Cosin's] earlier difficulty." Cosin, however, appears not to have thought so; for he says (2nd series), "Which other order, so qualified as is here appointed to be, was never made." These remarks apply also to a similar argument in a Letter by Mr. H. R. Droop, in the *Guardian*, Feb. 28th.

SECOND SERIES, written probably after 1638 and 1656, p. 230—33. Here, after mentioning, as being still by law enjoined, the Vestures named in the Book of 1549—viz., alb, vestment or cope, tunicles, surplice, hood, and the special Ornaments for the Bishop, he gives this Note—"*As were in use, &c.* Among other ornaments of the Church that were then in use, the setting of two lights upon the Communion-table or altar was one, appointed by the King's Injunctions . . . . to signify the joy and splendour we receive from the light of Christ's blessed Gospel."

THIRD SERIES, written probably before 1640, p. 438: "*Such ornaments, &c.* Without which (as common reason and experience teaches us) the Majesty of Him that owneth it, and the work of His service there, will prove to be of a very common and low esteem. The particulars of these Ornaments (both of the Church and of the ministers thereof, as in the end of the Act of Uniformity)," i. e., of Elizabeth, "are referred not to the fifth of Edward VI. . . . . but to the second year of that King, when his Service-book and Injunctions were in force by authority of Parliament. And in those books many other ornaments are appointed; as, two lights to be set upon the altar or communion-table, a cope or vestment for the priest and for the bishop, besides their albes, surplices, and rochets, the bishop's crosier-staff, to be holden by him at his ministration and ordination; and those ornaments," &c. See the rest in Note 3, p. 462, *supra*.

[7] In his *Particulars to be Considered, Explained and Corrected in the Book of Common Prayer* (*Works*, vol. v., 507), he says, as if he had almost foreseen our present controversy:—"But what these Ornaments of the Church and of the Minister were, is not here specified, and they are so unknown to many, that by most they are neglected. Wherefore it were requisite that those Ornaments used in the second year of King Edward, should be here particularly named and set forth, that there might be no difference about them." And he had thus continued the Rubric quoted above:—"that is to say—Surplice, &c.;" but these words he afterwards erased, as he had also done with the following addition respecting the Chancels:—"∴ be divided from y^e^ body of the Church &c.," and with this proposed title to the Ornament Rubric: "An Order for Ornaments to be used in y^e^ Church." Nothing is more probable than that he omitted these proposed changes simply because he felt that the temper of the times was too adverse to warrant drawing more particular attention to these points than was done in the old Rubrics; there is not the smallest reason for supposing that he had changed his mind respecting them.

With respect to the change of the words, "at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his Ministration," into "at all times of their Ministration[8]" the plea, that thus it was designed to get rid of any distinction of Vestments, certainly will not account for it, unless it can be proved that the Canon of 1603 as to the Cope was meant to be superseded, and so an approach made to the demand of the Nonconformists. But, then, what becomes of the argument that these Jacobean Canons limited the Rubric after, no less than before, its re-enactment in 1662? Probably, however, the change may be satisfactorily accounted for on two grounds—first, conciseness of expression; secondly, the removal of any difficulty which had arisen or might spring from the fact that in the "Certain Notes" of the First Book, it was said, "But in all other places, every minister shall be at liberty to use any surplice or no." It is not unlikely that, in their desire at that time to guard against the prevalent negligence and irreverence, the Revisers may have deemed it well to make the Rubric include private as well as public Ministrations.

4thly. It is objected "that Convocation [in 1661] had in view the Ornaments mentioned in the Rubric *at the end* of Edward VI.'s First Book—viz., surplice and hood. The cope mentioned in Edward's Rubric before the Litany was allowed by Canon Twenty-four in cathedrals, and was not specially contemplated in the new Rubric. But the thought of chasuble, albe, and tunicle never, I believe, entered their heads at all[9]."

So far, however, from simplifying the question, this theory only creates fresh difficulties, and does not even maintain all that it professes to support. The Rubric is limited to what may be used at "Matins and Evensong, Baptizing and Burying," and in these offices "the minister in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same shall use a Surplice"—no *Hood*—that is expressly limited to "Cathedral Churches and Colleges," unless, indeed (though this is not clear), the permission to "graduates" to wear it "where they do preach" is not confined to these places. As to Stole, or even Black Scarf, these were nowhere if this Rubric was meant to be the guide.

But this Rubric is followed by another, which prescribes that "whensoever the Bishop shall celebrate the Holy Communion in the Church, or execute any other public Ministration, he shall have upon him, besides his rochette, a surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastoral staff in his hand, or else borne or holden by his chaplain." Did then the Revisers of 1661

[8] Letter of Mr. William Milton to the *Guardian*, March 28, 1866. [9] *Ibid.*

intend to ignore this Rubric, and include the Bishops in their new Rubric? Mr. Milton seems to say so; and no doubt the Rubric of 1662 was meant to be the rule for them as well as for others, unless exceptions were elsewhere made in the Prayer Book. If this be so, then the Bishops, if they have ever since used their present Habits in the ordinary Services of the Church, have all along been wrong; for they too ought to have used Surplices only; nay, they had no right even in Cathedrals or Colleges to use a Hood unless they could also class themselves among "Archdeacons, Deans, Provosts, Masters, Prebendaries, and Fellows." Therefore, though it would be a great inconvenience to have Bishops denuded of a dress which, though certainly not very handsome (and for which their Scarlet Convocation Robes might advantageously be substituted), does distinguish them from Priests and Deacons; and though it would be a pity that any who have adopted the Pastoral Staff should have to lay it aside; there is no help for it but to vest them in the simple Surplice unadorned by any Ornament whatever.

In proof of his theory, Mr. Milton summons "six witnesses," and wishes "to offer them for cross-examination by others;" viz., Sheldon's *Directions* to his Clergy, the *Convocation Journal* of March 4, 1664, Cosin's *Visitation Articles* of 1662, Sparrow's *Rationale*, Bingham's *Reply to Baxter*, and L'Estrange's *Alliance of Divine Offices*. This Essay must decline the invitation, if only from lack of space. But this is the less to be regretted since, whatever else they do prove, not one of them furnishes any evidence to support the particular point for which they are produced; and part of what they are also cited to establish is open to the criticisms already made at p. 480. Moreover the theory itself seems to have been abandoned subsequently by its author, who at length discovers that "We have been all along in the dark" and (changing again his tactics) now objects:—

5thly—That the Elizabethan Statute (and consequently her Rubric and the subsequent Rubrics) "retains out of Edward's First Book not those ornaments which were in this Church from the old Ritual, but only 'such as were in this Church *by the authority of Parliament*, 2 Edward VI.,'" that is to say, as he explains it, "the use of cope and surplice at the Altar, and surplice with hood of the degree at all other ministrations;" for this case "was a new thing, introduced *by authority of Parliament*, 2 Edward VI.;" whereas, he also says, "the use of cope or chasuble, alb, and tunicle, was a continuation of the ancient ritual[1]. . . ."

[1] Mr. Milton's Letter to the *Guardian*, April 11, 1866. To which it is

New difficulties again, alas! The first Vestment Rubric of the Book of 1549, relating to the Vesture for Celebration, had therefore no "Authority of Parliament," though it was in the Book which the Act of Uniformity of 1549 authorized: it was only "a continuation of the ancient ritual." So, then, "ancient ritual" might be persevered in under the First Prayer Book without "authority of Parliament!" Why? Because it was Canon Law, sanctioned or not (whichever was the case), by Henry the Eighth's Revision Statutes? If so, what is to hinder its adoption now? The present Prayer Book and Act of Uniformity are not *more* exclusive than were the Book and Act of 1549, and the Canon Law is, moreover, alleged to have now (see p. 474) the Parliamentary authority which is said to have been doubtful in the second year of Edward the Sixth.

Neither can it be correctly alleged that "the use" of Cope and Surplice at the Altar, or of Hood in other Services was really "a new thing." Such Vestures on those occasions were as old as those which Mr. Milton considers to have been merely "a continuance of the ancient ritual." It was so far a novelty that the Communion Service *minus* the Consecration was dignified by a prescribed, though an incomplete, Vesture for the Minister: but why this use of these Ornaments needed "Authority of Parliament," and the other use required it not, is certainly not apparent.

Yet it is something to be welcomed that, notwithstanding difficulties, this latest theory lands the Church of England on a much higher Ritualistic ground in all her Churches, and not in Cathedrals alone, than probably would be supposed; Cope and

replied (*Guardian*, April 18), under the well-known initials of "E. C.," that "Wheatley, chap. ii., sec. 4," shows that "The Act in question refers us back to the First Book." So, too, in the *Law Magazine and Law Review*, Feb. 1866, it is said, p. 224: "The present Rubric, we may add, owes its authority to the Act of Uniformity (13 & 14 Chas. II., c. 4), which virtually incorporates the Book of Common Prayer, and has never been affected by any subsequent legislation. Whatever ornaments, therefore, of the Church and of the Minister, were in the Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., are now lawful. The question then arises—what are such ornaments? Now, we have no hesitation in answering, that they are those which were sanctioned by the 2 & 3 Edward VI., c. 1, and are mentioned in the Rubrics to the first Prayer Book, which we have already quoted. It is quite clear to our minds, that the sole intent of the 1 Eliz., c. 2, s. 25, stated above in the judgment of the Judicial Committee, was to restore the habits which the Minister was to wear according to the Rubrics of the first Prayer Book, and to sanction the Ornaments of the Church which are mentioned in that Prayer Book." But then, as has been contended above (p. 467), those Rubrics were not exclusive.

Surplice for the Altar Service; Surplice (and *Hood*, says its author) for all other Ministrations; full Ornaments at all times for the Bishop—Rochette, Surplice or Albe, Cope or Vestment, and Pastoral Staff—for these are not mentioned in the Notes at the end of the Book of 1549, as being the "appointed vesture," and therefore, by this test of Mr. Milton's, had also "authority of Parliament" in the First Prayer Book.

If this is what the Bishops meant in 1661, it is hard to see that they may not have meant a little more. *Chasuble*, *Albe*, and *Tunicle*, would scarcely have more alarmed the Presbyterian objectors in the Savoy Conference. Nay, it may well be doubted whether the addition of *Lights* and *Incense* would even have added to their fears, any more than they probably will to the surprise of those in the present day who may learn what, even on Mr. Milton's theory, the Rubric now requires. If the Bishops did not mean this, but contemplated nothing more than (as it has been seen some hold) *Surplice* and *Hood* (possibly *Scarf*) in all Ministrations, why did they suffer the objectors at the Savoy thus to misunderstand them? Nay, it seems passing strange that they should not kindly have told them so, thus relieving them from perplexity, and themselves from suspicion; for plainly such must have been the case when, in the "*Rejoinder of the Ministers to the Answer of the Bishops*," they ask:—"We have given you reason enough against the imposition of the usual ceremonies, and would you draw forth those absolute ones to increase the burden?" (*Documents relating to the Act of Uniformity*. London, 1862)—a question to which no answer appears to have been given.

Thus must terminate the first inquiry which this Essay proposed to make, namely, the *Lawfulness* of the Ritualism which has been brought into question. More might be said in support of the authority relied upon, and in reply to objections which have been brought against it, if the limits of the Essay permitted. It is hoped, however, that all the main features of the case have been exhibited, and that too, in a sufficiently distinct manner to enable the general reader to comprehend the present aspect of the subject, and to draw from it such conclusions as will tend to remove doubts whether, what is being advocated or attempted in the way of a restored Ritualism, can fairly produce on its behalf that sanction of the Ecclesiastical Law which it claims to possess. The writer is fully conscious of the defects which cannot but attach themselves to an argument of this kind proceeding from one who lacks the advantages which a lawyer would have in discussing the subject. But this drawback may not be without

some compensation arising out of the fact that Historical and Liturgical information is absolutely needful to the full examination of many points involved in the case, and that such information is not the peculiar property of the legal profession, but is equally at the service of all inquirers.

It now remains to consider the Second of the two questions which, at the outset, were mentioned as being asked; and this leads naturally to an examination of—

II. The *Reasonable Limits* of that Ritualism which the foregoing proposition has shown to be Lawful.

In dealing with this division of the subject, it is necessary, first of all, to observe—that by "reasonable limits" is not here meant a boundary line enclosing certain specified Ornaments and Usages which, under no circumstances, is to be overstepped. This would be to assume a dictatorial tone wholly inexcusable in the present Essay; not to say that it would imply a pretension to assist in regulating Ecclesiastical practices without having, on the one hand, any mission to represent Clergy and Laity who are entitled to be heard for themselves; and, on the other hand, any authority suggestively to determine a subject only to be settled by Convocation, or in Diocesan or Provincial Synods.

Besides, there is the consideration, that in an attempted revival of things strictly lawful, yet not morally obligatory owing to their long and continued non-enforcement by authority, it is essential on every ground of prudence and charity to consider what may be *profitably* done in any case where there seems to be sufficient warrant for making some effort in the direction of Ritualistic reformation. For it is obvious that there must be many degrees of fitness, dependent upon the training, disposition, and circumstances of Parishes or Congregations. What would disturb or content in one case, might only satisfy or enhance in another instance. Moreover, there is the great disadvantage that not only no clearly written rules or continuous traditions can be appealed to, but that there is also to be encountered a vaguer or preciser popular identification of the things sought to be restored, with what is found in another Communion which holds tenets and adopts practices held to be, and in some respects being, very foreign from the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England. Therefore it is that the warning is so often given —"All things are lawful, but all things are not expedient" (1 Cor. x. 23); "Take heed lest by any means this liberty [or power] of yours become a stumbling block to them that are weak"

(viii. 9): though, indeed, it is difficult to see the appropriateness of applying to the Laws of any portion of the Church, the counsels given by an Apostle to Christians touching their conduct in regard to Feasts upon Heathen Sacrifices.

Considering, therefore, these circumstances, it would seem to be the best course in this Essay to suggest some *Principles* which, being applied to Lawful Ritualism, may serve as a practical test in endeavours to recover it. These Principles must in themselves be *Reasonable* if they are to be serviceable in convincing the opponents or in guiding the advocates of a re-introduction, into the Public Services, of Ornaments and Usages which undoubtedly will more or less conspicuously change the general external appearance of Divine Worship in the Church of England, in proportion to the extent of its adoption in her Religious Edifices. The five following Principles apparently embrace the leading considerations which need to be borne in mind while seeking to discover the "Reasonable Limits of Lawful Ritualism."

1. That it should be Instructive to the Worshipper.
2. That it should add Dignity to the Service.
3. That it should sustain Objective Worship.
4. That it should be Independent yet Imitative.
5. That it should promote Catholic Intercommunion.

It will be desirable to make a few remarks by way of explaining and enforcing separately each of these Principles: it would seem then to be an important condition of the use of Lawful Ritualism:—

First—That it should be Instructive to the Worshipper.

To overlook or to deny the use of the visual organ as a means of acquiring religious information through the public teaching of the Services of the Church, has been a serious hindrance to profitable attendance thereat; and this by no means only in the case of *uneducated* English Church people. Hearing alone is, as experience proves, certainly not adequate to fully instructing either children or adults in many religious Doctrines; or at all events it fails to impress them duly on the mind. That this is no new view is plain from what occurred even in that process of reformation which sought to remove such excrescences as, in process of time, had come to disfigure, as it was thought, the Offices of the Church, and to render them less simple in their teaching than they were designed to be. Thus, in 1541, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury put forth a Rationale of Usages, drawn up apparently by Archbishop Cranmer, entitled "Ceremonies to be used in the Church of England, together with an Explanation of the meaning and significancy

of them." It treats of the Church, the Churchyard, the Rites and Ceremonies observed about the Sacrament of Baptism, Ministers, Services of the Church, and Ceremonies used in the Mass (Collier, Eccl. Hist., 191): and the whole is a most interesting and instructive practical comment on these things, showing how Christians may profit by considering their significancy. Thus, to take but one example, and that a most simple one, viz., that the Church is to be *washed;* it is said that this is "to admonish all Christian people to wash inwardly their own hearts and consciences, which be the living temples of GOD, before they shall approach to the use of any holy mystery there."

So, too, six years later, the Royal Injunctions of 1547 give an example of precisely the same principle, bringing out the great doctrine of the Incarnation and the union of the two Natures of GOD and MAN, by retaining the "two lights upon the high Altar, before the Sacrament" of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, and this "for the signification that CHRIST is the very true light of the world."

And two years afterwards, in 1549, the same idea of instruction through Ritualism was vividly present to the Reformers; while more than a century onwards it was carefully preserved by the Revisers of 1661 in retaining the Preface, "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained;" for, after stating the reasons for which any had been removed, they say of others that "although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church (for the which they were first devised) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred."

Secondly—That it should add Dignity to the Service.

It cannot be denied that the entire teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Church in all times points to such a mode of conducting Divine Service as is calculated to render it simple in its outlines and careful in its details, grand in its general aspect and harmonious in its several parts: being the Service of GOD, it is only fitting that it should be reverent, yet not so formal as to destroy that "perfect freedom" which is one of its characteristics. Moreover, as it professes to do honour to the King of Heaven in His earthly courts, it ought to have accompaniments fitted to represent that those attending upon Him as His ministers and servants are engaged in no common duties, and therefore need to be clothed in garments distinguishing their peculiar employment: "therefore," to use again the language of the Rationale, "for the adorning of the same

service, surplices, copes[2], and other vestments in the doing thereof, are very laudable and comely[3]."

And the like is also true of various Ceremonial observances which, though in themselves of little or no importance, and certainly non-essential, help to secure the doing in a reverent way, what, if done at all, ought not to be done carelessly or according to mere personal fancies. They are analogous to the natural yet regulated manners and movement of the Sovereign's attendants, and they show a sense of being engaged in high and special duties. Thus the posture of the Priest at times for which no direction is given, the use of the sign of the Cross (as prescribed in the Book of 1549) in consecrating the Eucharistic Elements, are Usages not forbidden, and in themselves suitable to the nature of the work he is engaged upon. But in these and any similar details, it is needful to consider whether there is risk of any being, not unfairly, accounted as trifling, and so not likely to enhance, but rather to detract from the dignified simplicity which should attach itself to acts of public devotion.

The impossibility of regulating, by precise Rubrical directions, observances of this kind, was clearly felt in preparing the Book of 1549; for in the "*Certain Notes for the more plain explication and decent ministration of things contained in this Book*" this general rule was given, "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth." Here is a guiding principle, equally well adapted to direct Clergy now as then with regard to practices left open by not being provided for. It gives ample scope for reverence which might become grotesque if rendered unnatural by constrained rule or habit; and it leaves it free to be corrected by comparison with similar practices which it was accounted needful to prescribe; thus

[2] The Copes in Durham Cathedral were first disused in 1759, when Bishop Warburton was Prebendary, owing, it is said, to the edge of the Cope interfering with his wig. Five Copes now remain there: 1. Purple Velvet, richly embroidered, and with a crucifix on the back; 2. Purple Silk, embroidered in Gold, with Saints on the Hood; 3. Crimson Velvet, embroidered in Gold, with Saints on the Orphrey; 4. Cloth of Gold and Blue Velvet, woven together in a pattern; 5. Crimson Satin, embroidered in Gold, David with the head of Goliath on the Hood: this Cope was given by King Charles I.

[3] Bishop Cosin, Notes, 3rd Series, says, "That which is to be said for these Vestures and Ornaments, in solemnizing the Service of God, is, that they were appointed for inward reverence to that work, which they make outwardly solemn. All the actions of esteem in the world are so set forth, and the world hath had trial enough, that those who have made it a part of their religion to fasten scorn upon such circumstances, have made no less to despise and disgrace the substance of God's public service."

securing, as much as may advantageously be, uniformity in essentials, and such liberty in accidentals as does not disregard the law of unity in diversity.

Thirdly—That it should sustain Objective Worship.

The complaint is far from being new or uncommon that the leading idea involved in all Public Worship (whether in its outward expression through common offices, or in its inward form of meditative contemplation)—viz., the direction of devotion towards some recognized Divine Presence—seems, from whatever cause, to be extensively lost sight of. This probably results mainly from the idea having been so commonly superseded by the practical acceptance of two other ideas—those of personal teaching, and of ecclesiastical dialogue—which have been the more prominent exhibition of the Services of the Church of England. Nor, if the case be examined, is this result much surprising, seeing that, on the one hand, the full Service, which was the special embodiment of objective worship, had become rare and occasional; and, on the other hand, that portion of it which was more frequent, and the other Offices which, on the whole, were regular, at least on the LORD'S Day, were certainly not conducted for the most part in such a manner as to preserve what lingered of the complete theory of Worship.

Holy Scripture and the Liturgy of the Church are the warrant for saying that it is essential to the realization of Objective Worship, that "before" men's "eyes JESUS CHRIST" should be "evidently set forth, crucified among" them (Gal. iii. 1); and that the mode of doing this is to be found in the fact that our LORD "did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that, His precious death, until His coming again," to be made in the Sacrament of the Altar. Upon obedience to this Divine command depends the Eucharistic manifestation of CHRIST, and consequently His real Objective Presence "under the Form of Bread and Wine."

It seems to be not too much to say that, looking at the matter historically, this idea of Objective Worship, in connexion with CHRIST'S Eucharistic Presence, gradually dwindled down in consequence of the decrease of Celebrations of the Holy Communion from the later years of King Edward the Sixth downwards, and from the contemporaneous neglect of almost all that was calculated to adorn the Altar and to dignify the Service.

It was the announcement of Malachi (i. 11), the last of the Prophets, that "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incense shall be offered unto My Name, and

a Pure Offering." This having been accepted in the Church[4] as foretelling the Eucharistic Sacrifice, is certainly one most forcible reason for striving to restore it again to its chief and proper place in the Services of the Sanctuary. But, then, as the "Pure Offering" itself begins to recover its true position, and to present before the sight of English Churchmen an objective reality, so it is specially fitted to draw out their devotion and to sustain their worship. It seems, then, at least, strange to separate what the prophetic word combined, and to withhold the Incense which was to accompany the Offering, by pleading (how successfully may well be questioned) a non-literal interpretation in excuse for discarding a practice once no less common in the English than it now is in the Greek and Latin Communions; and never, as there is sufficient ground for believing, lawfully abolished from the public ministrations of the Church of England[5].

Fourthly—That it should be Independent yet Imitative.

This principle is enunciated in the Thirty-fourth Article[6], and in the Thirtieth Canon[7] of 1603-4. It advocates Local customs,

[4] Thus Mede says (*Christian Sacrifice*, 471. Ed. 1648), "This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest times of the Church, a text of eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers as an express and undoubted prophecy of the *Christian Sacrifice* or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His Name: and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles."

[5] In Cole's MSS. (British Museum, 5873, p. 826) occurs the following notice of the comparatively recent use of Incense in Ely Cathedral:—"I have often heard Mr. Soame Jenyns, who lived at Ely when he was young, say, as also Messrs. Bentham and others say, that it was the constant practice on the greater Festivals at Ely to burn incense at the Altar in the Cathedral, till Dr. Thos. Green, one of the Prebendaries and now Dean of Salisbury, 1779, a finical man tho' a very worthy one, and who is always taking snuff up his nose, objected to it, under pretence that it made his head to ach." In the Churchwarden's Act-Books of S. Oswald's and S. Nicolas's, Durham, there are charges for Incense in the seventeenth century; and it is said that it was always used at S. Nicolas, when the Bishop came, until the middle of the last century. As these are the two principal Parish Churches, it seems probable that it was also used in the Cathedral.

[6] "It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word . . . Every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, ordained only by man's Authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

[7] ". . . . the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it.

yet recognizes Catholic practice. And this being the rule by which the Church of England would *order* her Ritualism, it must be the proper guide in *reviving* what is expressly appointed to be done; or in *introducing* any thing, whether old or new, which fairly comes within the limits of things not designed to be excluded from the Services of the Church.

In carrying out this principle, two considerations present themselves:—1. There is the fact that this Church ever had its own Usages on many points of Ritualism. Thus, for instance, the position of the Celebrant when he began the Service, and his posture after the act of Consecration; the variety of the Ecclesiastical Colours and the order of their use; the shape, in some respects, of the Eucharistic and other Ecclesiastical Vestments; the frequency and manner of using Incense; these differed to some extent from Foreign Churches even when they owned in common the Papal Supremacy. 2. There is the circumstance that, owing to the long disuse of most of the Ornaments and Usages in the Church of England, it is of much advantage to be able to consult in doubtful points the existing practice of the Latin and Greek Churches, which have continuously preserved a full and elaborate system of Ritualism.

From this it follows that in the Ritualistic rehabiliment of the Offices and Service of the English Church, it is only dutiful to consult, first of all, the once so generally received Sarum Liturgy and Hours; and where these are deficient in information, it is plainly allowable, nay, surely wise, to have recourse for guidance to the visible customs of East and West, and especially to the explicit rules of the latter, which, indeed, in this case, is the natural resort of us who are ourselves Westerns.

Hence, in dealing with more or less important Usages, such as the Mixed Chalice, the mode of Eucharistic Oblation and Adoration, the sequence of Colours at Ecclesiastical Seasons, the use of Incense, and the like, no really practical difficulty need present itself. There may be thankful imitation without servile copying, and loyal independence without narrow-minded avoidance or rejection: Primitive practice, Catholic consent, and Local tradition, jointly leading to morally reliable conclusions.

Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of *England* to forsake and reject the Churches of *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, *Germany*, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of *England* confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those Ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men: and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their First Founders."

Fifthly—That it should promote Catholic Intercommunion.

The growing desire for renewed intercourse with their estranged brethren in CHRIST is far from being the yearning of Catholic-minded members of the Church of England alone: it is shared in by those who are out of formal Communion with her, whether ranking among Catholic or Protestant bodies; and may well be accounted a token that their common Baptismal bond of Unity has not been absolutely severed, and that in virtue of it this note of sympathy vibrates throughout them. Hence it is said, that as the probabilities of Communion are far greater between the Church of England and the Nonconformists which surround her, than between her and the Latin and Greek Communities, she should so regulate her Ritualism as to encourage the approach of those who are the likelier to embrace her fellowship.

But to this it is enough to say that past experience does not warrant this belief; and that, if it did, this could not justify a great Branch of the Catholic Church in still further paring down her Ritual and plucking away her Ornaments. To do so would argue a forgetfulness of her own professed character, and an indifference to the disparaging effect which it could not but produce towards her on the part of other great Branches of the Church. Abandonment of her own principles would not conciliate Dissenters, and would only further estrange Roman and Greek Christians. It is not only differences of Doctrine and Discipline, however much exaggerated, that have kept the Church of England separated from these latter; the outward aspect of her Services, witnessed or described, must have materially justified the belief that a Catholic Liturgy was no part of her inheritance. First appearances often decide the question of friendship; and it needs but little imagination to conclude that many a foreign Catholic may have had his hopes of the Church of England blighted when he saw so much wanting to assimilate the Externals of her worship to what he himself was accustomed to witness in his own Communion. Among other things it can hardly be doubted that the Position of the Priest at the North End of the Altar would well nigh convince him that the Great Christian Sacrifice could not be pleaded when such an unritualistic feature every where presented itself.

That the Church of England never did intend so to depart from the universal practice of Christendom as to place the Celebrating Priest neither looking towards nor looking from the people, but in an entirely novel position, standing sideways or at an angle to them, may be confidently affirmed; though it

is impossible to produce the proofs here[8]. It would therefore be the legitimate carrying out of her own Catholic purpose, in this respect, to restore the Celebrant to the position which, it is contended, the Rubrics assign to him, namely, before the Altar and looking eastward, except when directed to change that position. The general structure of English churches makes it needless to consider here his position in a Basilican arrangement of the Altar.

This is only another instance, besides those already given, of which it may safely be affirmed that a return to earlier usage would remove blemishes in the leading features of the Church of England's Worship, and so perhaps would, more directly than is supposed, dispose other Catholic communities to look at with a more favourable eye, and to listen to with a more friendly ear, suggestions or overtures having for their object what surely cannot but be desired—namely, such recognized Intercommunion at least as would be involved in permitted Eucharistic reception, under needful commendatory restrictions.

In what has now been, but briefly, said touching these Principles of Ritual Limitation, and in the Illustrations accompanying them, some indications may perhaps have been furnished of a line of argument which might be considerably extended, and of its bearing upon other Ornaments and Ceremonies. It is not meant, of course, that in applying these Principles to Details, *every* point of Ritualism should bear the limiting test of *all* the Principles here suggested; it is enough if it be shown to conform to any one of them. But in the Examples which have here been mentioned it will be found that each one does correspond to the entire five-fold rule; and therefore possesses the fullest claim to be regarded as most clearly coming within those Reasonable Limits which have been proposed as the boundaries of Lawful Ritualism.

[8] But it will be well to cite the Answer of the Bishops to the complaint on this point at the Savoy Conference. The Presbyterians took "exception" to the Rubric—"Then shall the priest or the bishop (being present) stand up and, turning himself to the people, say thus," &c. They said—"The minister turning himself to the people is most convenient throughout the whole ministration." To this the Bishops answered—"The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions, it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did; the reasons of which you may see Aug. lib. 2, de Ser. Dom. in monte." Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 353.

To sum up. The preceding pages have attempted, not unsuccessfully, it is hoped, to prove these three things:—

FIRSTLY—That, notwithstanding all the objections which have been raised, the Law of the Church of England in regard to Ornament and Ceremonial seems plainly to be what has commonly been received, and what was defined in 1857 by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, viz., That what was legally in use in the Second year of King Edward VI., i.e. (as now ruled), *under* the Prayer Book of 1549, is lawfully useable still, unless by any subsequent law of equal force it has been and continues to be altered or abolished.

SECONDLY—That, among other Ornaments and Usages which the Law so defined will sustain and sanction now, the following are supported by such adequate direct or indirect Historical Evidence as to render it sufficiently evident that they "were used under the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth;" and that, not being now Legally prohibited, they "may still be used" under the present Prayer Book; viz., the ancient Vestments of the Bishops and other Clergy (see pp. 461, 482, 486-7); the Two Lights on the Altar; the Incense; the Mixed Chalice; the Eastward Position, in front of the Altar, of the Priest and his Assistants in the Celebration of the Holy Communion.

THIRDLY—That these last-named Ornaments and Usages, fully satisfying as they do the Church of England's own governing Principles for regulating the externals and accessories of her Services, may most reasonably be urged as being the Five[9] prominent (though not exclusive) points of the Charter of an English Churchman's Ritualistic Liberties; and therefore, in exhibiting them where circumstances fairly warrant their employment, he ought not to be regarded as exceeding in things permissible, or as slighting the claims of Lawful Authority[1].

To an argument of this kind, respectfully claiming a freedom to act upon the Church's Law, where it seems desirable and

[9] As Archdeacon Freeman in his recent Pamphlet, *Rites and Ritual*, has mentioned these same points, it may be as well to observe that the present writer arrived at his conclusions without any knowledge of the Archdeacon's views on this subject.

[1] "All that the Ritualists have hitherto done is only a natural and appropriate setting forth, by external acts and symbols, of doctrines, which may be lawfully held by members of the Church of England; and if they have gone beyond what the Law strictly allows, they can retort on their opponents that they do not come up to what the Law strictly requires. We have no sympathy either with such doctrines or such practices, but looking at the real position which our national Church occupies, we see no occasion for any violent outcry, far less for any violent measure." (*Law Magazine and Law Review*, Feb. 1866, p. 231.)

useful to do so, it has been replied from various quarters, and doubtless will be answered again, that it destroys the principle of Uniformity, and so tends to perplex and unsettle the minds of members of the Church of England by furnishing the appearance of two different kinds of Religious Service in one Communion.

But it may fairly be replied, that if the Uniformity which was practised (supposing it could in any true sense be called Uniformity), was not the Uniformity designed, much more if it presented only a low and inferior standard of practice, it were better to risk the evils of diversity than to persevere in at least as great evils arising from conformity. The contrast presented in the existence, side by side, of a revived lawful and a stagnant permitted Ritualism, at least has this not useless advantage, that it raises in men's minds the question—Whether of the two is most agreeable to the Church's Law, and so ought to be the standard of the Church's practice?

The allegation that the divergence from old custom disables English Churchmen from recognizing the Service of their own Book of Common Prayer is, to say the least, an exaggeration which may well be discredited. It can hardly be seriously pretended that a person who can follow the Service of the Church of England, as customarily conducted, could have any real difficulty in also joining in it where it happens to be carried out with the Ceremonial appliances which, it is contended, are Legally authorized.

It might be further urged, that, on the principles of those who maintain that, the Church of England being a National Church, it ought therefore to regard the varying circumstances and views of its members, there could hardly be a greater unfairness than to deprive of a more ornate and elaborate, yet Lawful, Service those who desire it; while permitting the simplest—sometimes the hardly reverent—Service, where indifference accepts it, or perhaps dislike of both the Church's Doctrine and Discipline would reject aught besides.

There is one fact, however, which deserves to be noticed because it may serve as some precedent to guide us now in dealing with the objections which have just been considered; it is connected, indeed, not with a period of Ritual revival, but of Ritual abolition. The Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI. reduced, in 1552, as is well known, the obligatory standard of Ceremonial to as low a point as could well be suffered if the Church of England was to retain any external appearance distinguishing her from a Presbyterian Community. Under such circumstances, her vast

accumulation of Ornaments, thus rendered for the most part *unnecessary*, presented a prize equally coveted by more than one description of spoiler. This led to the appointment of Commissioners throughout the Kingdom to survey and make Inventories of the Goods of the Church; they were also directed to see that the Ornaments not ordered to be sold were put in safe custody, "Leaving nevertheless in every parish Church or Chapel of common resort, one, two, or more Chalices or Cups, according to the multitude of the people in every such Church or Chapel; and also such other Ornaments as by their discretion shall seem requisite for the Divine Service in every such place for the time." (Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. p. 112.)

The proof of the execution of these Commissions is to this day forthcoming in the large collection of these Inventories, still preserved in the Office of the Public Records, which were made in the subsequent period of Edward's reign. They furnish the most ample testimony of the largeness of the discretion which the Commissioners exercised; continually in the List [2] of what was "left for use in the Church," there are mentioned Ornaments which it was absolutely illegal to use if the theory be true that nothing might be employed but what was prescribed in the Prayer Book itself; for, besides Altar Crosses and Altar Candlesticks [3], they left Chasubles, Copes, Tunicles, and Albes—Ornaments which certainly were not obligatory, on the contrary, are commonly supposed to have been absolutely abolished by the Prayer Book of 1552.

It would be a most unwarrantable assumption, that, with such stringent directions especially, the Commissioners exceeded their

[2] See *Lawful Church Ornaments*, p. 90, for a List of Goods "left in the Church" of Stanford-in-the-Vale, Berks. Also the *Church Review*, Sept. 1865 to April 1866, for the Inventories of seven Counties, showing the Vestments consigned to the "Use of the Church;" and for three others, mentioning a variety of Ornaments and Vestments to be "safely kept and preserved."

[3] It has been contended (e. g. *Guardian*, Sept. 1865), in reference to the two Altar Lights, that the words "before the Sacrament," in the Injunctions of 1547, mean that they were to burn before the *reserved* Sacrament, and that therefore they are not to be used at the Celebration of the Holy Communion. But Cranmer's Visitation Articles of 1548 (a date which shows that the Injunctions of 1547 were still in force, see p. 469), merely say "two lights upon the high Altar." (Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 23). Moreover, that these did not pertain to the *reserved* Sacrament, is shown by Cardinal Pole's Inquiry in 1557, "Whether there do burn a lamp, or a candle before the Sacrament," i. e., as his Injunctions of 1556 show, before the "tabernacle sett in the midst of the high Altar" (*Ibid.* 122 & 170). There can be no question that the Eucharist would not then have been Celebrated without the "two candles, or one at least" (see p. 462), which the Canon Law absolutely required. The Illuminated Books and MSS. of the period abundantly prove the practice.

powers. The supposition, then, is natural and reasonable, that they found a strong attachment in many places to the old Ceremonial, and an indisposition to be deprived of it by the loss of the necessary Ornaments; and that, consequently, they used their discretion in not needlessly depriving the people of what they accounted their religious privileges. If this was the principle acted upon then, it were indeed strange to contradict it now, when the Law of the Church requires such Accessories of Divine Service.

RITUAL RESTORATION, within its *Legal* bounds, seems a legitimate pursuit for loyal English Churchmen: some *principles* to guide that pursuit have now been suggested; they are but the re-statement of grounds upon which the Church of England professes to take her stand. The object of such a Restoration is a return to an older state of things which the existence of certain laws implies to be a better condition than that which the last three hundred years have for the most part witnessed.

That some reform was needed, probably few qualified to speak would be bold enough to deny. That it should have thus far taken the direction of adherence to ancient precedents, is a source of satisfaction to probably a far larger number of Clergy and Laity than is at all imagined, or can be estimated by the number of Churches in which any marked Ritualistic advances are to be witnessed. The movement is deeper, broader, and more general than most suspect; and is intimately connected with the sounder Theological Doctrines which have won their ways to the convictions and hearts of earnest Church people. To attempt to dislodge it by party tactics, by opprobrious epithets, and especially by accusations of disloyalty or dishonesty, could only have the effect of banding together its advocates in a more combined action, and enlisting the sympathies of numbers who, though standing aloof, are far from being wholly opposed.

Former enterprises, conducted by those whose belief and practice did not pretend to be in accordance with the character which the early English Reformers desired to stamp upon the Church of England, reduced her to a Ritualistic condition which, for the more part, has been her bane and her disgrace; it was a proof of what perseverance could effect at a time when carelessness, indifference, ignorance—one or all—proved too great a drag upon any serious resistance which could be offered by the Bishops. A reaction has at length come; the tide has turned: the Catholic leaven is working out the Puritan leaven. It is surely too much to say, if indeed any have so said, that there is nothing Providential in this; that it is only a transient epidemic, the resultant

of some few ardent minds fevered with the love of singularity. Let the opinions of certainly not a few elders, men undoubtedly wise and cautious, Laics no less than Clerics, men of the world, too (as the phrase is), at least suggest re-consideration and counsel further inquiry before condemnation is pronounced.

But that the movement needs much prudence and discretion to conduct it towards a result advantageous to the Church of England cannot be denied. That it has provoked opposition within the Church itself is evident; but that it is *therefore* wrong may fairly be disputed. That it proceeded without waiting for the countenance or sanction of Authority, is no evidence that it disregards, much less disrespects it; it need prove no more than the belief that to seek advice from those who may ultimately have to adjudicate, is to place them in a delicate, perhaps in an unfair position. That it is ready to welcome guidance (which while fully recognizing what the Law of the Church of England strictly requires, is disposed to give it a liberal practical interpretation), is not without some witness in the past, and therefore may be hopefully relied on in the future.

Similar difficulties, however, arose, and the like objections were made when the movement was limited mostly to the domain of Doctrinal teaching; nevertheless it succeeded. It was still more marked on these grounds when it took the directly practical form of the restoration and decoration of Churches; but the Prophet's warning prevailed: "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this House lie waste?" (Haggai i. 4). Now that the complement of advanced Church adornment, and the accompaniment of received Sacramental Doctrine, is sought in the revival of those "Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof" which are more especially identified with the Church's Altar, to have misgivings of the result would imply a distrust of the past and a doubt of the future progress of the Church of England in things which concern her existence no less than her well-being.

Rather, surely, it were best to listen to another Prophet's exhortation and to apply his counsel to a cause which is not beyond the scope of his predicted energetic revival in the, then expected, but now present, development of God's ancient Church: "Awake, Awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the Holy City!" (Isaiah lii. 1.) So be it.

Thomas Walter Perry.

The Liturgies of 1549 and 1662 contrasted and compared.

THE Liturgy of the Church of England, in the form which it assumed in the year 1549, was a work of time. Preparations had long been made to pave the way for its compilation; and the labour which resulted in the Communion Office of the First Book of Edward VI. was the fulfilment and completion of these preparations. The project of a revision of her Ritual, both ordinary and eucharistic, says an Author who has learnedly written on this question, "had in truth occupied the attention of the English Church from a far earlier period than is commonly supposed." "It is usually represented," continues Archdeacon Freeman, "that in the year 1548-49, a body of divines, then first selected and commissioned by the Crown for the purpose, and resting their authority on no broader basis, took in hand for the first time the revision or reconstruction of the ancient Offices; and thus produced at a single effort the earliest form of the English Prayer Book. Such a representation, however, does very imperfect justice to the real character of this important movement. The work thus accomplished did not merely—which is the most that is generally admitted—go forth with the sanction of Convocation, but had, in the truest sense, originated in that body, and was carried through by members of it; and so, was in a far stricter reality the work of the Church by representation than it would otherwise have been."—(*Principles of Divine Service.* Vol. ii., p. 101. Parker, 1857).

Three-and-thirty years before the publication of King Edward VI.'s First Book, that is "as early as the year 1516, we discern the first indication of a steady design and endeavour, never afterwards abandoned, of amending the existing condition of the ancient English Service Books." In that year appeared a revised edition of the ordinary Office of the Sarum Use. This edition reappeared in 1531; and two years later the Eucharistic Office was similarly dealt with. And in these editions, to use the words of the author to whom I am indebted for these preliminary remarks, and to whose exhaustive work I must refer the reader for further details, "we discern two, at least, of the leading

principles which governed the revision of 1549; first, the simplification of the use of the Office, and secondly, the increased provision of Holy Scripture." In 1534, Archdeacon Freeman has remarked and placed on record, that the publication of the older editions of the Office Books suddenly ceased; and in the case of the Liturgy was never resumed. From about the year 1538 began to appear, in English, the "Pystles and Gospels," which were used in the Communion Office. "This expedient was clearly an instalment, yet without touching the public ritual books, of the ordinance ten years later (1547) by which the Epistle and Gospel were ordered to be read in 'English and not in Latin.'" In 1541, the Archbishop moved in Convocation, that the "Liturgical Books might be reformed;" and shortly after, by a regular act of that body, the Sarum Use was made obligatory on the province of Canterbury—an earnest, as the author of the *Principles of Divine Service* says, "of the preponderance which that Use was destined to carry in the revision ultimately accomplished." Whilst in the year following a Committee of Convocation was definitively appointed, by which the Service Books in the Church of England were to be "newly examined, corrected, and reformed."

The appointment of this Committee marks an era in the liturgical history of the Church. The Archdeacon, with much ingenuity and great learning, traces the influence of the Committee on the revision movement in its different phases. He gives weighty reasons for believing that it became "a standing institution" of the period. He shows that its labours appear again and again in the subsequent course of events. He finds the names of its members at successive stages and in successive results. And, at last, he quotes the authority under which "certain grave and learned Bishops, and others, were to confer together," the issue of which conference was the publication, first of the liturgical fragment of 1548, and then of the complete Book of Common Prayer in the year 1549. The various facts and circumstances which are adduced in the *Principles of Divine Service*, "seem to guarantee the continuity and virtual identity of the final committee with that primary one, and so to impart a stamp of organic wholeness, as well as of Convocational authority, to the entire process of revision from 1542 to 1549."

This brief summary—chiefly in the words of another—has not been made without a purpose. These historical details have not been quoted in order to make an attractive beginning to a somewhat dry, though important subject, nor for the purpose of sheltering myself behind so high an authority on the points in

question as that of Archdeacon Freeman. I have desired to show, and the study of the *Principles of Divine Service* will prove that I have concisely, but certainly, shown, that the First Liturgy of King Edward VI., so far as it went, was a reflection of the mind, and an exhibition of the deliberate judgment of the English Church on the subject of a revised Office for Holy Communion in the vernacular. If we admit the right, as I suppose we must admit the right, of every National Church to decide, with due submission to the Church Universal, on the form and manner of celebrating its chiefest mysteries, the importance of this position can hardly be exaggerated. These are unquiet times of rumoured liturgical revision. It is threatened, on the part of the State; or, more strictly, efforts are being made—which certainly will not remain content with late discomfiture—to move the machinery of the State in this direction. It is, and can be possible only—if the acquiescence of Catholics, lay or clerical, be desired—at the hands of the Church as represented in Convocation. Nothing could make it constitutional save the authority of that body, with the support of the temporal power. But it is not at all likely to come to pass with the consent of either; and, under present circumstances, it is not at all desirable that it should, even with the sanction of both. Still, it is well that we should distinctly call to mind, who it was that compiled our earliest English Office, and what it was that they compiled. Archdeacon Freeman, in no uncertain language, answers the first question—it was emphatically the work of the Church by representation. As an answer to the second question, I would venture to assert that the Liturgy of 1549 is the standard of ritual of the modern English Church, so far as she has ever possessed an authorized standard.

This statement requires some explanation. In the first place, I do not say that King Edward's First Liturgy is the standard of ceremonial of the later Church. Ceremonial is but an integral portion of ritual; and I am not concerned, at present, with the ceremonial of the Church. My position has reference to the subject of ritual, which is at once the embodiment and expression of Christian doctrine. And in this particular I apprehend, that the Edwardian Liturgy is the standard which the Church carefully framed and deliberately sanctioned. That the standard is a perfect one, I do not assert; nor yet that it is an absolute authority with us at the present day. It is one, no doubt, with which an English Catholic may be content, as the heritage of his Church; and both in its form and principle of arrangement, it is considerably in advance of our present Office. Hence the

Liturgy of 1549 is, abstractedly, a desirable prize for Churchmen to strive after. And although, under existing circumstances, we most strongly deprecate any practical efforts to remodel our Office, even on the principles of the Edwardian Liturgy; yet, if revision be forced upon us, and if the Church in reality sets herself to work once more to reconsider her Order for Holy Communion, there can be no doubt that the Office of 1549 is the standard to which she ought to appeal, for the purpose of bringing the later English Liturgy into stricter conformity with the earlier Sarum Use. And there is much reason to think that such was the intention of those who compiled Edward's First Book. Had they been allowed free course of action, and longer time for its development, there is little doubt that the Liturgy of that Book would have been assimilated yet more closely to the ancient Office from whence it sprang. Indeed, the formula of 1549 bears evident marks of haste, as if, at the last, and despite all their preparations, the compilers had lacked the time or the opportunity to perfect all the minor details of their work.

Whether this theory be sound or not, it is noteworthy in what terms those who in 1552 so grievously marred the labour of so many years, nevertheless speak of the First Book and the reasons they assign for its alteration. These reasons, which may be found in the Act of Uniformity of 1552 (a statute, like that of 1549, still in force so far as it is not repealed by later Acts), are avowedly based upon expediency, not on principle; whilst the terms in which the earlier Book is spoken of, though well known, may yet be cited afresh with advantage. The preamble declares the Prayer Book of 1549 to be "a very godly Order . . . agreeable to the Word of GOD and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people . . . . and most profitable to the estate of this realm." These words certainly afford a foundation for the assertion that the First Edwardian Liturgy was considered to be a standard of ritual, even by those who, for reasons of expediency, were led to tamper with that standard. Neither do the last restorers of our Prayer Book speak a different language. The Caroline divines, to whom, under GOD, we are indebted for preservation from the latest and most Protestant revision with which the Book of Common Prayer has been threatened since the year 1552, take the same view and express the same opinion, only in more general terms. In the Preface which they wrote for the Book of 1662, they distinctly look back to the standard of the Offices of Edward's First Book; and whilst acknowledging that some alterations had been made of necessity (referring, I suppose, to the restoration of the Prayer Book in Queen Elizabeth's reign),

they seem to base the majority of variations from the earlier Book on considerations of convenience and expediency. They are also careful to add of the First Prayer Book of Edward, that "the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts made against it by such men as are given to change."

It is also remarkable, that in Edward's Second Book, along with those abnormal alterations from which we still suffer, certain variations from and additions to the earlier Book were made, of a decidedly Catholic character. This, together with other evidence in a similar direction, would seem to point to the existence of a small, though staunch and influential minority in the leading counsels of the time—a minority which, though powerless to over-rule, was sufficiently powerful to make its voice heard, as well as to restrain, to modify, and to guide the decisions of the greater number. But perhaps the most conclusive proof that the Liturgy of 1549 has ever been considered to be the standard of ritual to the later English Church, may be found in the history of each successive restoration of Catholic doctrine or custom in the revision of the Prayer Book in 1559, in 1604, and in 1662. For it is a matter of fact, that after the first deplorable deformation of the labours of the Convocation of 1549, every fresh revision of the Office for Holy Communion has resulted in a nearer approach to the earliest national Liturgy; and a gradual approximation has been made surely, if slowly, to the original vernacular Liturgy of the English Church.

One other point in the argument remains to be noticed; but on this I lay no stress, as the case, so far as I can frame it, is independently complete. It is, however, worth the attention both of the ritualist and of the historian to consider, how far Convocation, by the mere fact of making authoritative alterations, can make valid that which in itself is wanting in Church authority. Now we have no historical proof that the Second Book of Edward VI. received the sanction of Convocation[1]. And in the absence of such

[1] Since the above was written, my attention has been drawn to a letter of Cranmer's, reprinted by Mr. Perry in his *Declaration on Kneeling* (p. 77), with reference to the Second Book of Edward VI. It contains this sentence:—"And now the Book being read and approved by the *whole state of the Realm* in the High Court of Parliament, with his Majesty's Royal Assent, that this should be now altered again without Parliament, of what importance this matter is, I refer to your Lordship's wisdom to consider." So far as I know, this is the only direct evidence in favour of Convocational authority for the Book in question which has yet been discovered; for the italicised words are

evidence—an absence for which the *Principles of Divine Service* vainly endeavours to account—the assertion cannot be disproved, that the Book of 1552 was not issued under the authority of the Church by representation. If this be so, it seems difficult for a non-legal mind to understand how, without retrospective legislation on the part of the Church (of which, again, we have, I believe, no evidence), certain revisions can be valid whilst the document in which the changes are made is lacking in validity. It may be said, and said truly, that the revision in the year 1662 supplied that Convocational authority which was needful; and that the Book of Common Prayer comes to us with the entire sanction of the Church of the Caroline age. Yet the point which I have raised seems to make for the position claimed for the Liturgy of 1549. For, if a flaw in the Church authority for any document at a certain date be at all comparable to an error in an early stage of a mathematical problem, the accuracy of every subsequent process can no more rectify the original mistake in the calculation, than the later sanction of the Church, I apprehend, can legitimately dispense with the absence of Convocational authority for the document in the first stage of its history. This argument, if well founded, would be of the nature of cumulative evidence to prove, in a Catholic point of view, even if its value be disallowed legally, that the First Liturgy of King Edward VI. ever has been, and is still at the present day, the standard of ritual in the Church of England.

It is of some importance to keep distinctly in mind the difference between the true Church view and the strictly legal view of this question. The facts relating to the revision of the Prayer Book have of late been strangely misinterpreted, as though they supported Erastian principles; and distorted, to cast doubt upon the legal aspect of the matter. It is a favourite position in maintenance of Erastianism, that the authority for the restored use of the Book of Common Prayer is to be assigned to legislative enactment in the reign of Elizabeth; and it has also been contended that the revision of 1662 was not less superficially considered than hurriedly carried out by the authority of the Church in representation. Both these positions are untenable. Those who, as Churchmen, inconsistently claim the "omnipotent" authority of Parliament for the use of her Offices by the Church, are forget-

supposed to involve the same. But the latter part of the sentence appears to negative this interpretation; and even the earlier portion seems to me to uphold the position assumed in the text. It is a question, however, which deserves consideration. Possibly further researches in the State Paper Office may bring to light fresh and decisive evidence on the point.

ful of the fact that what one Parliament had rescinded another Parliament could reimpose; and that the statute of Elizabeth, as Mr. Procter in his *History of the Prayer Book* says, simply "repealed the Act of Mary, which had repealed the Act" of Edward VI. (6th Ed., p. 55.) Whilst those who, still less reasonably, attempt to discredit the labours of the Caroline divines, and strive to undermine their authority by charges of hasty decision and want of consideration, have but carelessly read the history of those times. The revision of 1662, though it secured Convocational authority and Legislative enactment in a short space of time, was no ill-considered work of haste. It was rather the result of quick and decided action, after long, cautious, and much weighed discussion. This is not less evident from the study of the records of the times, than from the deliberate utterance of those who restored the English Offices: for the Preface to the Prayer Book, which was added at the last revision, ends with these decisive words—"Yet we have good hope, that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocation of both Provinces, *with great diligence examined and approved,* will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious Sons of the Church of England." But whatever amount of truth adheres to either of these statements, the restoration and final revision of the Prayer Book in the year 1662 combines in one the two elements which constitute authorized forms of public worship in a Church which is at once Catholic in essence, and Established by law. The Ecclesiastical aspect and the legal view are here at one. The State gave its adhesion to the work of the Church; and Parliament affixed legal penalties to a non-recognition of that which was authorized by Convocation.

The inquiry which I have undertaken is a limited one, on the very wide field of liturgical study. It consists in contrasting and comparing the earliest with the latest form of the Eucharistic Office of the English Church, without considering the intermediate stages through which that Office passed. It would have been of some interest to discuss the results of the sudden and almost inexplicable revision of the Liturgy in the year 1552, and to examine the causes which led to such an abandonment of principle in so short a time. It would have been of some importance to watch the gradual restoration which the Liturgy underwent, after its unlooked-for transformation, from the debased condition to which it was reduced in the Second Book of Edward VI. through its various amended forms up to the comparatively restored integrity in which it now appears, in its present, though

still imperfect approximation to the original standard of 1549. But it would have been more important, and not less interesting, to note the similarity with, and the departure from, the older Latin Offices of the Church of England in the vernacular and reconstructed Books of the later Church, either in the form the Liturgy assumed in the year 1549, or in the order in which we possess the Office at the present day. Into none of these questions, however, do I propose to enter. The range of inquiry would be far too extended for the present Essay, even if I were capable of travelling over it. My intention is less ambitious. But if that at which I aim is of less moment, it hardly less requires our careful attention. Indeed, in some points of view it is of greater practical importance. For, by comparing the Order of Holy Communion of 1662 with that of the year 1549 immediately, and not through the medium of the various changes to which the Liturgy has been subjected, we are enabled to see at a glance what the Office formerly was, and what it has become; we can at once estimate the extent of our losses, and can the more easily calculate our need of restoration.

The method which I propose to adopt will be, in the first place to analyse the contents and to describe the arrangement of the earlier Office, as compared with the later, in general terms; and afterwards to contrast, somewhat more in detail, the mutual variations which exist in the several portions of both. This examination, if attempted at all, must of necessity be carried out in a summary and partially superficial manner. I shall only venture to deal with some of the more salient features of both Liturgies. And in order to confine the discussion within the limits of an Essay, I must beg leave to take for granted some theorems now debated amongst us, which, however, I should very willingly demonstrate, if space permitted. I shall also, without special leave, assume and argue upon certain liturgical principles—for every science must have its own principles, and liturgiology is no exception to the rule. The consideration of the variations between our present Office and that of 1549 will give me occasion to speak of some features in the customary mode of conducting Divine Service, and to show how far such features are in accordance with, or in opposition to, not only the Edwardian Liturgy, but also the Office of King Charles II.; and this discussion may tend to give a present and practical interest to the Essay. I will only add to these prefatory remarks, that I use the term "Liturgy" in its primitive sense, as an equivalent to "the Office of Holy Communion"—not in its extended meaning, as including all the services contained in the Prayer Book: and

that if, for shortness' sake, I make mention of Edward VI.'s Office, it is of the Liturgy of 1549 that I speak.

Before I proceed to examine in detail some of the more striking characteristics of the First Liturgy of King Edward the Sixth, and to note the similarities with or the divergences from it in the Office which we now possess, it may not be amiss to say a few words on the contents and arrangement of both forms. This will be most easily done by discussing the structional arrangement of the Order of 1549 in the language of the Prayer Book of the present day. The familiarity of the reader with the order and names, in their technical terms, of the different parts of the Liturgy, as we are wont to use it, will be assumed: But to make what follows more distinct, it will be well to indicate the general outline and the chief divisions of all Offices for the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament.

It is not without reason that we believe all Liturgies, from the earliest ages, and both in the East and West, to have been divisible into two well-defined portions. It is certain that such division has obtained, at least for the last twelve centuries, and probably for many more, in the liturgical Office of this Church, in common with that of the whole of Western Christendom. These two integral portions were termed the Ordinary, or the less sacred and partially variable section, and the Canon, or the wholly changeless and more sacred part. These chief divisions were again subdivided. The Ordinary consisted of the Introduction and Oblation; and the Canon was composed of the Consecration, the Communion, and the Post-Communion. So that we find a twofold general division, and a fivefold subdivision of the Order of Holy Communion, as it formerly existed from very early times. And these generic portions of the Liturgy, with their specific sections, are clearly marked both in the Edwardian and in the Caroline Offices; the former retaining what may be termed the natural, and certainly is the liturgical, order of the component parts, the latter being content with an introverted arrangement.

Perhaps these integral portions of the Liturgy, with their respective subdivisions, will be more easily understood and remembered, if they be described in the order and language in which we are accustomed at the present day to use and consider them. Having regard, then, to our present Prayer Book, it may be said that—

I. The Ordinary contains (*a*) the Introduction to the Office, and (*b*) the Oblation of the Elements; and—

II. The Canon includes, (*c*) the Consecration, or Recitation of the Words of Institution, (*d*) the Administration of the Holy Sacrament, and (*e*) the Thanksgiving or Post-Communion.

Leaving, now, the two greater divisions of the Office, an analysis of the five lesser portions produces the following results:—

1st.—The Introductory portion of the Liturgy extends to the end of the Creed; and in our present Office, includes the first LORD'S Prayer without the Doxology, the invariable Collect for Purity, the Law or Ten Commandments with the *Kyrie Eleison*, one of the two Collects for the Queen, the variable Collect or Collects for the Day or Season, the Epistle, Holy Gospel, and Nicene Creed.

2nd.—The next division of the Office reaches from the Creed to the Act of Consecration as its two boundary lines. It embraces the Offertory, the Oblation, and all that matter, variable or changeless, which clusters around the Prefaces. It includes the Offertory Sentences; the Collection and Presentation of the Alms; the Preparation and Oblation of the Elements; the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church; the Warning to the congregation, the Appeal to the negligent, the Exhortation to the faithful, and the Invitation to intending communicants. It concludes with the Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words, the *Sursum Corda*, the Daily and Proper Prefaces, the *Sanctus*, and Prayer of Humble Access; and is termed the Oblatory portion of the Liturgy.

3rd.—The Consecration, or Canon, follows next in order. This, the Sacrificial division of the Office, in our present Use, contains the Act of Consecration, and the Communion of the Priest.

4th.—The Communion, technically so called, the Administration, or Sacramental portion of the Liturgy, takes the fourth place. And this is simply a ministerial act for the "Houselling of the faithful," to use an old term, or the Communion of the people—an act which, of course, is incalculably precious to the inner life of the Christian, but unimportant in a Sacrificial point of view. Whilst the last portion or the

5th—is solely Eucharistic in character, and is termed the Post-Communion or Thanksgiving. It extends from the second LORD'S Prayer with the Doxology, to the Benediction, both inclusive; and comprises within these limits the two forms of Thanksgiving and the *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*.

Some apology is needed for stating at length details with which the reader must be conversant. But it is of some moment that a distinct idea be formed of the earlier and more harmonious arrangement of the Liturgy, as it appears in the Edwardian Prayer Book; and this will be more readily realized by remembering systematically the arrangement which differs from it, into which it was forced, and which has gradually and in part recovered its ancient landmarks, namely the Order of the Sacrifice of the Altar as restored in the year 1662.

Bearing in mind, then, the sequence and terminology of the Caroline Liturgy, the details of the Office which was gradually arranged and deliberately accepted by the English Church when she decided to use an Order in a language understanded of the people (and which, it cannot be too often repeated, has the authority of past generations), now require consideration. I restrict myself to details, because the two organic divisions of the several Offices into the Ordinary and Canon, are the same in both; although, as will be seen, the relative position of the subordinate portions have been very considerably altered.

In the Liturgy of 1549, the Introduction, or first division, began, as it begins with ourselves, with the LORD'S Prayer and the Collect for Purity. The Introit or Psalm appointed for the day was then sung, which was followed by the Lesser Litany or the *Kyrie Eleison.* The *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* followed next in order, which, in its turn, was succeeded by a short Versicle, *Dominus Vobiscum,* with its proper Response. The Invitation to pray then ushered in the Collect for the King and that for the Day or Season, though which of the two took the precedence admits, perhaps, of a doubt. The Epistle, Gospel, and Creed were next said in due course. "After the Creed ended" the Sermon was delivered or the Homily was read, and after the Sermon the Exhortation which begins: "Dearly Beloved in the LORD" might be said—for discretion was permitted; or, if the people were negligent to come to Communion, another and a stronger form, which begins, "Dear Friends," was required to be used. With this Appeal to the careless, the Introductory portion of the Office was concluded; and it is evident at once that our present Liturgy has lost the Introit and the *Gloria in Excelsis* which belong to this division, that the Exhortations have been removed to a later and less appropriate portion of the Service, and that an invariable lesson from the Old Testament, which we call the Law or the Ten Commandments, has been added.

The Offertory, or second division, came next in order. The Oblatory portion in Edward VI.'s Book was short, and embraced only the Offertory Sentences, the Oblation of the Alms and Elements, *Dominus Vobiscum,* the Daily and Proper Prefaces, with the concluding *Sanctus.* And here it will be seen what a large fraction of the Caroline Liturgy has been interpolated in this place, and how sadly the order and arrangement of the first English Communion Office has been departed from.

But if the Edwardian Offertory was short, the Canon, or centre of the central Office of Christian worship, was proportionately long. The great act of Consecration was drawn out into one grand, con-

tinuous prayer, which included, with certain additions to be noticed by-and-by, and in the language of our Prayer Book, the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church, the Consecration or Canon proper, the first Thanksgiving in the Post-Communion, and the LORD'S Prayer. All this was uttered without a break; and a noble form of Consecration it may be allowed to be, even by those who use and love our shorter form. But at the close of the LORD'S Prayer, the people joined in vocally, and made answer by saying aloud the last of its seven-fold and comprehensive petitions. Then followed, *after* Consecration, the reader will remark, the reciprocal Blessing on the part of the priest and people in the form of a Versicle, *Pax Domini*, with its proper Response, together with a sort of Antiphon or short lesson—"CHRIST our Paschal Lamb," which will be considered later on in this Essay, neither of which we now possess. The Invitatory, "Ye that do truly," succeeded. This was followed in due order by the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Prayer of Humble Access. And then, and not till then, did the priest consummate the Sacrifice of the Altar by communicating himself, and thus bring the long sacrificial portion of the Liturgy to a conclusion. The omissions from this division of the Office in the Book of Charles II. are apparent in the description of the Canon in that of Edward VI., and need no further mention at the present.

The Communion of the faithful, of course, stood in the fourth place, in the position which it now occupies; the *Agnus Dei* being sung "in the Communion time," whilst the people received the Blessed Sacrament.

The fifth and last division of the Office was enriched, both in principle and in detail by a feature which we have lost, but not beyond the reach of substantial restoration—"Sentences of Holy Scripture, to be said or sung every day one, after the Holy Communion;" as well as by the last of the *Dominus Vobiscum* Versicles and Responses. And King Edward VI.'s First Liturgy concluded with the second Post-Communion Thanksgiving, and the Peace and Blessing.

The structional difference between the two Liturgies of 1549 and 1662 is, of course, exceedingly great. This is not the place to estimate the value bestowed, or the detriment inflicted, by the radical changes which transformed the earlier into the later Office. But the variations may be with advantage summarized, before the alterations are considered in detail. The Liturgy of Edward, as the expression of the mind of the Church of England of its day, must be taken as the gauge by which, in the Office of the Caroline divines, to test our actual loss or gain, and the

standard by which to estimate the variation between the two. I would remind the reader that I do not propose to give an exhaustive statement of the changes to which the English Liturgy has been subjected; but taking the Edwardian Office as a model, it will be seen at once that the Introit has been withdrawn, and the *Gloria in Excelsis* has been removed from the forefront of the Order to its very close. The Exhortation and Warning, which once stood together with the Sermon or Homily (to which they bear a strong family likeness) in the Introductory portion of the Liturgy, as being non-essential, and only intended for occasional use, have now been placed further on in the Office, in a more prominent and less suitable position, apparently as if designed for more frequent employment. The Proper and Daily Prefaces which formerly concluded the Oblatory division of the Liturgy, and naturally came immediately before, as a preface to the Canon, have now had their position altogether changed, not only relatively but positively. They have been inserted in the midst of that to which they once formed an introduction, and have been further divided from that to which they still are intended to act as a preface—namely, the Act of Consecration.

But it is in the sacred Canon that revision has run to the freest extent of riot. The Consecration, which, in the Edwardian Liturgy, was so full and so complete, which was preceded by the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church, and followed by the Oblatory Thanksgiving, and which, together with the other elements mentioned above, formed one consistent and harmonious whole—this, the culminating portion of the Divine Mysteries, is but a shadow of its earlier self. The Canon, if it be not irreverent to say so, has been at once decapitated and curtailed. It has been dismembered; and its dislocated portions have been re-adjusted with no recognizable organization. Accident, not design, seems to have ruled the day; for though ingenious ritualists give authorities for individual changes, and either perceive reasons or invent excuses for special alterations, yet, as a whole, the present order of the Office is absolutely unique—it stands alone and without support in the family of Liturgies. The Prayer for the whole Church has been separated off from the Consecration, and planted in a position immediately after the Offertory. The Oblation of the Sacrifice, after the Recitation of the Words of Institution, together with the LORD'S Prayer (with which it has relatively changed place), has been removed from its accustomed place, and made to do duty, and that with a very ill grace and only by an accommodation, as the first of the two Post-Communion Thanksgivings. The great body of devotion which begins with the

Invitation and ends with the Prayer of Humble Access, has also been uprooted and transplanted into an unwonted position in the variable portion of the Liturgy, in part before and in part after the Preface. And the Post-Communion has been denuded of the Anthems from Holy Scripture, by which the last division of the Office was enriched, and with which it formerly commenced.

Nor is this all, for the devotion-kindling Versicles and Responses, *Dominus Vobiscum*, &c., have disappeared from our Liturgy. The *Gloria* before the Gospel only exists, and GOD be praised that it still exists amongst us, traditionally. A remarkable omission, to which I shall call attention in the proper place, has been made in the *Sanctus*. Large, and not unimportant contractions have been made in the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church, which will also claim consideration further on in the Essay. The Anthem, "CHRIST our Paschal Lamb," after the Canon, and the *Agnus Dei* during the Communion, have been wholly removed. Additions in certain places have also been made, the benefit of which is not always, or, at first sight, obvious; though some of the changes fairly admit an interpretation which is not generally applied to them. In two points only can our Liturgy bear comparison with, or be supposed to possess any practical advantage over, that of the year 1549; and the first of these is only a matter of taste, which is counter to, rather than in harmony with, principle. The magnificent Hymn, *Gloria in Excelsis*, in its present position, though ritually incorrect, serves as a very devotional act of adoration; and when sung, forms a beautiful and grand conclusion of a high celebration. Whilst the only loss that can be estimated as positively gainful, is the omission of a rubric, which unaccountably (on any ritual grounds) had crept into the Catholic Liturgy of Edward VI.'s First Book, and was not less unaccountably expunged from the Protestant Office of Edward's Second Book, the rubric, I mean, which forbad the world-wide custom of elevation after Consecration.

The different structional arrangements of the two Offices, which I have endeavoured to point out, and their respective agreement and divergence in detail, will be seen in a condensed form from the following tabular statement[2]. The table will also serve to show the two great divisions and the five subdivisions which have ever formed the component parts of the Liturgy of the Church of CHRIST.

[2] This table is taken from the Preface of a work in the press, *The Liturgies of* 1549 *and* 1662, to be published by Mr. Masters, which presents on opposite pages the ordinary daily Office of the two Liturgies, so arranged as to show their points of agreement and difference.

The Liturgy,

ACCORDING TO THE USE OF

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE SUPPER OF THE LORD AND The Holy Communion, Commonly called The Mass, 1549.	THE ORDER of the Administration of The Lord's Supper, OR Holy Communion, 1662.
THE ORDINARY.	
I. The Introduction.	**I. The Introduction.**
Lord's Prayer and Collect.	Lord's Prayer and Collect.
Introit.	
	Law or Ten Commandments and
Kyrie Eleison.	Kyrie Eleison.
Gloria in Excelsis Deo.	
Dominus Vobiscum.	
Collects for Day and King.	Collects for King and Day.
Epistle.	Epistle.
Glory be to Thee, O Lord.	
Holy Gospel.	Holy Gospel.
Nicene Creed.	Nicene Creed.
Sermon or Homily.	Sermon or Homily.
Exhortation and Appeal.	
II. Oblation.	**II. Oblation.**
Offertory and Oblation.	Offertory and Oblation.
Dominus Vobiscum.	
Sursum Corda.	
Daily and Proper Prefaces.	
Sanctus.	
	Prayer for Christ's Church.
	Warning for Celebration.
	Appeal and Exhortation.
	Invitatory.
	Confession and Absolution.
	Comfortable Words.
	Sursum Corda.
	Daily and Proper Prefaces.
	Sanctus.
	Prayer of Humble Access.

Liturgy of 1549.	Liturgy of 1662.

THE CANON.

III. The Canon.	III. The Canon.
Prayer for Christ's Church.	
Consecration.	Consecration.
Oblation of Sacrifice.	
Lord's Prayer.	
Pax Domini.	
Christ our Paschal Lamb.	
Invitatory.	
Confession and Absolution.	
Comfortable Words.	
Prayer of Humble Access.	
Reception of Priest.	Reception of Priest.

IV. The Communion.	IV. The Communion.
Communion of Faithful.	Communion of Faithful.
Agnus Dei.	

V. The Post-Communion.	V. The Post-Communion.
Post-Communion.	
Dominus Vobiscum.	
	Lord's Prayer.
	Oblatory Thanksgiving, or
Thanksgiving.	Thanksgiving.
	Gloria in Excelsis Deo.
Peace and Blessing.	Peace and Blessing.

Finis.

Additional Collects.	Additional Collects.

We are now in a fairer position, whilst remembering the order and arrangement of the Liturgy of 1549, to perceive in detail some of the points of similarity and divergence which it offers of our present Office. The reader will expect certain salient features only in the contrast and comparison to be noticed. Some of these will suggest questions of ritual now discussed amongst us. The chief points of which, space will allow the con-

sideration may be classed under three heads, in the treatment of which, however, I wish to disavow all originality :—

I. A comparison between the two respective Canons.
II. An examination of certain rubrics in the Liturgy of 1549, and specially of those which bear upon attendance at Holy Communion. And
III. A consideration of some features in the Edwardian Liturgy which are wanting in the Book of 1662, or *vice versâ*.

I. Of course, the chief interest in the comparisons between the Edwardian and Caroline Liturgies centres in the Canon. The exact contents of this division of the Office of 1549 may be seen by a glance at the table given above. We will confine our attention to the Canon, or the Act of Consecration, of the earlier Book, which consists of three portions, and, allowing for certain additions, is identical with, 1st, the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church ; 2nd, the Consecration proper ; 3rd, the first Post-Communion Thanksgiving, in the Liturgy of Charles II. The consideration of these three parts will cover a large area of the debateable ground between the two Liturgies : and will show us, to some extent, what we have actually lost, and what we may hope at some future time to regain. We will consider them in order.

1. "When the Clerks have done singing" the *Sanctus*, the rubric of 1549 orders, "Then shall the priest or deacon turn himself to the people and say, "*Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.*" Our present Office contains these words additional—*Militant here on earth.* On these words not an essay only, but a volume might be written. But here I claim the self-assigned privilege of taking for granted certain elementary liturgical positions. The Catholic doctrine, and the ritual use, of Prayer for the faithful Departed, is one such position. It is therefore assumed, that the only literal interpretation of which certain words admit in the Caroline "Church Militant" Prayer, involves Prayer for the Dead ; and that such prayer finds its place of liturgical right in the English Office for Holy Communion. That this is not the only place in which our present forms of public worship call to remembrance, and intercede for, the holy dead, is well known. We pray for them generally, in the first Thanksgiving in the Post-Communion, when we beseech our Heavenly Father to grant that we, and all His "whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits" of CHRIST'S Passion. We pray for them specifically, in the first suffrage of our Litany, in the very words in which the ancient English Church was wont to intercede for her dead, during untold generations, when such

prayers were indisputably employed. If this assumption be allowed, it is only needful to state that the words, "that with them [i. e. with GOD'S servants departed this life in His faith and fear] we may be partakers of Thy Heavenly kingdom," are not invalidated by the expanded title of our present Prayer, which to some minds appears to be unduly exclusive and absolute. This is capable of proof from analogy, over and above the proof from grammar and common sense.

For, to take the latter proof first—It is open to demonstration that the titles of many, if not of the greater part of the prayers in Divine worship, are not, were not intended to become, and could not be made, exhaustive. Take a few cases by way of example:—The general Confession in daily Matins and Evensong, after the due confession of sins, contains a supplication for mercy, a prayer for pardon, and an aspiration for amendment of life. The Absolution, beyond the declarative assertion of its primary object, concludes with an exhortation to penitential perseverance. The first Collect for the Queen in the Communion Office, not only prays for the whole Church before naming her Majesty, but after the Queen has been mentioned in intercession, devotions on behalf of her Majesty's lieges form its concluding petitions. Nor are these the only instances which might be brought forward of the truth of the above position. Whilst, if we turn to a proof from analogy, the evidence, if any thing, is almost more conclusive. For, a pre-Reformation prayer can be pointed out, and of late has been reprinted in the *Directorium Anglicanum* (2nd Ed., pp. 53, 54), which unequivocally prays both for the living and the dead, and is inscribed with a title very nearly identical with that of the Church Militant Prayer of 1662. If, therefore, it be admitted that the title of the Prayer is not, and was not intended to be exhaustive, it simply indicates that the Church on earth is one of several subjects treated of, that is one of more than a single portion of CHRIST'S Church on whose behalf intercession is made to GOD.

Hence, we are driven from the title of the Prayer to its contents. And here we shall find ourselves placed in a dilemma, which to a Catholic mind is inexpressibly painful. For, if the words in question do not contain, as I hold they do contain, a distinct enunciation of Prayer for the holy Dead, it follows that the Liturgy of the English Church is the only living Liturgy, the only known extant Liturgy, which is wanting in remembrance of its faithful Departed. From which dilemma we may devoutly say, Good LORD deliver us. If there be one element of ritual composition which is only not essential to the validity of the

Office, it is this act of remembrance of those who are separated from us by time and space. Prayers for the Dead are found in every single Office in the manifold forms of Liturgy in the Eastern Church. They are present both in the long-disused and in the now living Offices of the Western. In either case they are found in Liturgies of all families, of varied locality, of different ages, from Apostolic times downwards. And what is more remarkable, they are found in the Service Books of schismatic and heretical Churches, as well as of the orthodox Communions. Nor may we admit that the English Church is an exception to this universal practice. Though in somewhat cautious terms, yet by no means in unwonted language, her voice ascends in unison with the unbroken pleadings of Christendom. Inspired by supernaturalized instinct, fortified by Apostolic example, sanctioned by the custom of every age and every clime, she day by day before GOD'S Altar offers up her intercessions, not only for her own holy Dead, but in remembrance of the whole Church, for the faithful Departed of all time.

And here it may be added, that had no polemical prejudice weakened men's sense of the grammatical requirements of a literal interpretation, it is impossible but that the force of words should have exerted its own inherent power, and that prayer for others, as well as for ourselves, would have been admitted in the terms approved by Convocation in 1662. The reasons which weighed with Convocation not to restore the fuller form of the same petitions from the Book of 1549, it is not our present purpose to inquire. We have to deal with results, not with causes. As English Catholics, we are only concerned to show, that on this point our national Liturgy is not out of harmony with the other Offices of Christendom; we are content to assert that Prayer for the Dead—a feature which is not wanting to any extant Liturgy—is not lacking to the Order for Holy Communion of the Church of England of the present day.

It may not be amiss, however, to remind the reader of the more complete form of intercession which the English Church deliberately sanctioned and made her own, when she revised her national Offices, and published her vernacular Liturgy in the sixteenth century. Acting up to the full teaching of Catholic consent, the First Book of Edward concluded the prayer for CHRIST'S Church with these words, which it will be at once admitted, are not less devout and beautiful than they are without doubt primitive and Scriptural:—"We commend unto Thy mercy (O LORD) all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest

in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy SON, may altogether be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice—'Come unto Me, O ye that be blessed of My FATHER, and possess the Kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.' Grant this, O FATHER, for JESUS CHRIST'S sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

The argument for, and example of, Prayer for the Dead has led me to anticipate a later portion of the Edwardian Prayer for CHRIST'S Church. There is one feature in its earlier portion which demands attention, and which we unhappily do not now possess. This consists, first, of a form of intercession for the actual worshipper, which in the edition of 1662 has been contracted into the words, "Especially this Congregation here present," but which in its more extended form was certainly not less expressive, and contained these words following:—"Especially we commend unto Thy merciful goodness this Congregation which is here assembled in Thy Name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of Thy SON." And secondly, it consists of thanksgiving for GOD'S Grace exhibited in His Saints, with a humble prayer to be enabled to follow their good example—for the omission of which in the early revise of the Liturgy it is more easy to imagine a reason, than to account for its non-restoration in the latest revision at the hands of the Caroline divines. But it would be difficult to discover any rational, still more any Christian reason for either. The reader shall judge for himself. In the sentences which have been suppressed from our English Office, nothing can be more Scriptural than the cause assigned for the sanctity of the Saints, nor more reverent and inclusive than the recitation of the names of the Saints, nor more devout and becoming than the expression of thankfulness for, and a desire to imitate the example of the Saints —and yet we possess them not:—"And here we do give unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all Thy Saints, from the beginning of the world; And chiefly in the glorious and most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of Thy SON JESU CHRIST our LORD and GOD, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, whose examples (O LORD) and stedfastness in Thy faith, and keeping Thy holy commandments, grant us to follow."

Apart from a few unimportant verbal variations, these are the only points of difference, with one exception, between the Edwardian and Caroline Prayer for CHRIST'S Church. This exception

is caused by the insertion of an additional clause in the latter which was rendered needful by the omission of a certain element of the Consecration—viz., the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST. Our present Office, after the Offertory and Preparation of the Elements, beseeches Almighty GOD "to accept our alms and oblations," as well as "to receive our prayers"—a supplication which, as we shall see, would have been out of place in the Liturgy of 1549. But, before we proceed to the next division of the Edwardian Canon, it may be well to call to mind, to how great an extent the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church, as we now use it, has been tampered with, both to the detriment of the worshipper, and to the perfection and unity of the Prayer. One part has been contracted, one has been omitted, and one epitomized. The first and third have still retained in solution their ancient meaning; the second has completely vanished. Yet we may rejoice, however, when we consider the hostile influences to which the Prayer has been subjected, and from which it has hardly freed itself, that no essential has been suppressed, and that our loss is only (if we may so speak of any spiritual deprivation) one of a higher degree of devotion.

2. The Act of Consecration, or Canon proper, now follows immediately in the Liturgy of 1549. This portion of the Office, the reader will remember, formerly consisted of the Commemoration of the Passion, the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST, and the Recitation of the Words of Institution. Our present Order consists of the same three-fold elements, of which the first and last, with the exception of certain verbal differences of small importance, are identical. But in the middle portion,—the Invocation,—as is well known, the differences are neither verbal only, nor only insignificant. Yet here, again, we may congratulate ourselves that nothing essential to the validity of the Sacrifice has been omitted, however grave may be the alteration effected in 1552, and not restored in the following century. The words of the Invocation, as they appeared in the Edwardian Liturgy, are these:—"Hear us, O Merciful FATHER, we beseech Thee, and with Thy HOLY SPIRIT and Word, vouchsafe to bl+ess and sanc+tify these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be to us the BODY and BLOOD of Thy most dearly Beloved SON JESUS CHRIST." Such is the Invocation of the HOLY GHOST as deliberately set forth for her children's use by the English Church in the sixteenth century. This Invocation we have lost, and we can scarcely too deeply deplore the loss, or earnestly desire that it may be restored to us. But I venture to express my conviction, that the omission of this Prayer at the instance of the

Puritan party in 1552, or rather its non-replacement by the Catholic divines of 1662, has been unduly used by way of polemical capital, and arguments heavier than it will legitimately bear have been laid upon the circumstance. The original omission presents a fair object for criticism; but the most that can be proved in the matter of its continuous omission is, that the Church in the age of Charles II. was of opinion that its re-imposition was neither essential nor expedient. On the latter point, we may fairly allow the Convocation of 1662 to be a competent judge: on the former, it is impossible not to hold to the opinion at which that Assembly arrived.

We will, however, consider this question, in one point of view, more closely. The Invocation of the HOLY GHOST, either expressed or implied, is a feature in all Liturgies. It need hardly be stated, that in the Eastern Offices this feature has been placed in a far more prominent position than it ever obtained in the Western Liturgies—at least, so far as can now be proved, in what may be termed the historic period of the Latin Rite. If space permitted, forms of prayer for the Descent of the HOLY SPIRIT, from Eastern sources, of singular beauty and devotion, might be quoted. But the differences between the Greek and Latin Churches are not confined, in this case, to the prominent or secondary position which the Invocation assumes. There is another, and liturgically far wider, divergence between them in its use; for whereas the Western Rite uses a brief form of Invocation at the Oblation of the Elements, *i. e., before* the Consecration, the Greek Offices do not invoke the HOLY GHOST until *after* the Words of Institution. This question is too wide an one to enter upon here. But these acknowledged variations on the part of the two great Churches of the East and West—for who shall venture to judge between them?—should make persons very careful before they offer an opinion on the conduct of the English Church in this matter. Why the more developed form of the Invocation was abandoned, cannot be said; but the fact that Convocation in 1662 did not see fit to restore the more primitive form, may make us pause ere we condemn the condensed form of Invocation which we still possess. Its value certainly cannot be determined by its length; and the Invocation is not the less real, because it is implied instead of expressed. The careful wording of the sentence—"Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of Bread and Wine, *according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution,*" must of necessity involve all that is needful for the validity of Consecration; for they expressly place the earthly priest in the very attitude of Him Who was Divine. Whilst the

position in which we find the Invocation uttered, immediately before the actual Words of Institution, has at least the virtue of liturgical consistency, and cannot be pronounced to be wrong until the variations between Eastern and Western Christendom on this point are authoritatively decided. Of course, in an action so transcendental as that of Consecration in the Holy Eucharist, the element of time, and the question of precedence and succession, has really, and can have, no place. And on the same ground, because the action of the Sacrifice is Divine, not human, the arguments of those who hold that the non-restitution of the words of Edward's Liturgy in the reign of Charles II., quoted above, could affect the sacrificial character of the Office, or was intended to eliminate all reference to the Sacrifice on behalf of the Sacrament, are too highly improbable to deserve further notice.

Before we consider the last division of the Canon, two rubrical points are noticeable. The one is a positive direction expressed by a sign; the other an injunction involving a verbal inhibition. (1) The reader will have observed that the sign of the cross was printed twice in the middle of the Invocation, in order that the priest might make use of it at the words indicated. Hence, we have here the employment of the sacred symbol of our faith distinctly authorized in the Order for Holy Communion, by the Church of the age of Edward, in addition to its use, which is explicitly commanded by the Church of the present day in the Office for Holy Baptism. (2) The rubric at the end of the Words of Institution in the Book of 1549 enjoins that, "These words are to be said turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people." With this direction, however, we can now have no possible concern—and for this reason. This ill-advised rubric disappeared from the Liturgy under the very influence, or perhaps in spite of the very influence, which placed it there, at the first revision of the Office, three years after its publication. Of course, we can only conjecture, either why it was imposed, or why it was discarded. Protestant prejudice is sufficient to account for the presence of the inhibition of so absolutely harmless, and yet so venerable and symbolical a ceremonial. Catholic custom, which it was impossible for the celebrant of that day to ignore, or for the people to forget, or for either to require that it be stated in written characters, is more than sufficient to account for the absence of the inhibition. The rubric, in all probability, was never obeyed; and like wise lawgivers, in this respect, the divines of Edward decreed to sweep away, once and for ever, that which was neither needed nor observed. And hence, again, the custom of Elevation, for a short

while formally disallowed, and by the withdrawal of the inhibition as formally restored, once more became, and still continues to be, in accordance with early English use, the unwritten, traditional, and authoritative law of the Church of England. (See *The Elevation of the Host.* By Dr. Littledale. Palmer, 1865.)

3. The last division of the Canon of 1549 consists of the first Post-Communion prayer in our Liturgy, with certain verbal alterations and additions. These differences will be at once perceived if the Prayer be reprinted at length, indicating by brackets those parts which have been omitted in our version, by italic letters those wherein verbal variations between the two forms exist, and by full stops that somewhat has been added to the edition of 1662:—"[Wherefore,] O LORD and Heavenly FATHER, [according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved SON, our SAVIOUR JESU CHRIST,] we Thy humble servants [do celebrate, and make here before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy SON hath willed us to make: having in remembrance His blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same,] entirely *desiring* Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the Merits and Death of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O LORD, ourself, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively Sacrifice unto Thee: humbly beseeching Thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may [worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, and] be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy SON JESUS CHRIST, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any Sacrifice: Yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, [and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of Thy holy Angels, to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of Thy divine Majesty;] not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through [. . . .] CHRIST our LORD; by Whom, and with Whom, in the Unity of the HOLY GHOST, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O FATHER Almighty, world without end. Amen. [Let us pray. As our SAVIOUR CHRIST hath commanded and taught us, we are

bold to say—Our FATHER, &c. *The Answer.* But deliver us from evil. Amen."]

The variations between this prayer and the form in which we use it, though not unimportant, do not call for any special notice. The Memorial of the Institution has been transposed, as the reader will remember, in the Office of 1662 into the Canon, and therein represents the Invocation of other Liturgies. The Memorial of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, is a very ancient feature in this part of the Canon of the early English Church: and its removal, for no obvious reason, can only be accounted as a loss. The next sentence within brackets is required, because in 1549 the Communion of priest and people was still in the future; whereas when the Oblation of the Sacrifice was made to do duty for a Post-Communion Thanksgiving, the Communion of priest and people was in the past. But the following paragraph, which speaks of a ministry of the holy Angels at the Sacrifice of the Altar, is more important. It would seem from a comparison of the Use of Sarum with the Book of Edward, that the revisers of the former Liturgy have somewhat misapprehended the purport of the prayer which they undoubtedly adopted, as well as adapted in the later Office. The rationale of this prayer, as it was originally used in the English and as it is substantially used at present in the Greek Church, may be found ably elaborated in the *Principles of Divine Service* (Vol. ii., pp. 175—177), by Archdeacon Freeman, from whose deductions, however, from his own "peculiar doctrines," all believers in the Real Objective Presence will instinctively shrink.

The dislocation and rearrangement of the various portions of the Edwardian Canon have been mentioned above. The second LORD'S Prayer, for instance, was relegated to a later part of the Office, and was used as an introduction, in the Post-Communion, to that prayer of which it formerly formed the conclusion. It is only needful, further, to state that this portion of the Canon of 1549 was closed with the reciprocal Blessing between priest and people, the *Pax Domini*, in the form of a Versicle and Response, and the following Anthem; both of which were suppressed at the revision of the First Book of Edward:—"*Then shall the Priest say:* The Peace of the LORD be alway with you. *The Clerks.* And with thy spirit. *The Priest.* CHRIST our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when He bare our sins on His Body upon the Cross; for He is the very Lamb of GOD, that taketh away the sins of the world: wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy Feast with the LORD."

II. Let us next consider some of the rubrics in the Liturgy of Edward VI. which bear upon attendance at the Holy Sacrament, and especially upon that question which will be recalled by the words, "non-communicating attendance."

1. The first rubric of the first English Liturgy was composed in the following terms:—"So many as intend to be *partakers* of the Holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over-night, or else in the morning, afore the beginning of Matins, or *immediately after*." A reference to our Prayer Book, will show that the intention of the present first rubric is identical with that of its original form, although it ends with the words, "to the Curate at least some time the day before." Without doubt, the main object of both these rubrics is to furnish an opportunity to the people to avail themselves of the privilege which the last paragraph of the "Warning for the Celebration," in our own Office affords them. This privilege is stated in the form of an invitation in King Edward's Book:—"And if there be any of you, whose conscience is troubled and grieved in any thing, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of GOD, and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us (as of the ministers of GOD and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." The general agreement of this direction with the words of our present Warning is obvious; and those who remember the requirements of the English Church at the hands of her children, before communicating, which were customary prior to the date of the Edwardian Liturgy, will be at no loss to understand the principal object which this rubric was intended to effect, when interpreted by the subsequent Exhortation. The discipline of the mediæval Church, which was co-extensive with Latin Christianity at the date of the issue of the English Office, as a matter of fact, was hereby relaxed. But so far was the Church of that day from being disposed to restrict the liberty of her members, and still less to deny them the spiritual consolation of her ministry, that, whilst she transformed an obligation into a privilege, she was careful to afford opportunity for the voluntary discharge of a stricter system of discipline which she no longer enforced, and to provide for the self-imposed requirements of the higher and deeper realities of the Christian life in Confession[3].

[3] As the latest and almost only English work on this subject, the reader will do well to consult Mr. Carter's valuable treatise, *The Doctrine of Confession*

2. That there were, however, other and less important objects contemplated by the first rubric of 1549, than spiritual intercourse, of whatever degree of intimacy, may be freely allowed. Some very practical benefits, if it were generally observed in its spirit as well as its letter, would follow the re-consideration and adoption of this rubric. I will mention two of them. First, in small parishes, where a daily Eucharist is contemplated by the priest, and desired of the people, a little mutual arrangement and neighbourly co-operation amongst the congregation, and conference with the clergyman, would ensure a daily attendance of two or three gathered together in His Name, at "GOD'S Board"; and would obviate the difficulty which some priests feel in celebrating, where there may be a doubt of the actual number of possible worshippers. Those who express a desire either for communicating or worshipping, or both, on a certain number of days, weekly, could without difficulty be divided amongst and allotted to the several days of the week. Secondly, another practical benefit which would arise, in some degree, from an observance of this rubric is this—that the celebrant would be able, to the same extent, approximately to calculate the probable number of communicants at the ensuing Service, either on Sundays, or on the week-days. This calculation would tend to prevent uncertainty to the celebrant, as well as needless delay

in the Church of England (Masters, 1865), and especially, as bearing on the text, chapter vi., "The Exhortation of the Eucharistic Office," wherein the alterations which this Exhortation has undergone in the several revisions of the Prayer Book are considered and their results summed up in these few words:—"The effect of these successive revisions has been to re-affirm repeatedly the principle of Confession, the invitation always being in the Office, whether or not put forward prominently; while the last and final change stamped it with even greater definiteness than before. The invitation when first introduced was, be it well observed, an entirely voluntary insertion on the part of the framers of the Office. Their successors not only preserved it, but invested it with increased significance" (page 121). The concluding words of the Edwardian Exhortation, as exhibiting the mind of the Church of that age in her authorized Office Book, and as containing "godly and wholesome doctrine" and counsel "necessary for these times," deserve to be quoted; for the Church then required "such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences; where as he hath no warrant of God's word to the same."

to the congregation; and it would also serve to diminish the probability of other ritual inconveniences, either a second Consecration (which is much to be deprecated) necessitated by an insufficient preparation of the Elements, or more unseemly results caused, in some places, by their superabundant provision.

3. Two other points in the Edwardian rubric seem to deserve a passing notice; and to these attention has been called by the italic letters in which the words are printed. (1) The concluding words of the rubric, which allow of a discretionary power to the intending communicant in giving notice to his clergyman, necessarily imply an interval of time between the end of Matins and the beginning of Holy Communion, in the early years of the reign of Edward VI. This fact appears to have been overlooked by some who have written rather strongly on the question of our present Sunday and other Services, and of the need, which is simply imaginary, to commence the Liturgy with Morning Prayer, or at least with the Litany. The rubric incidentally, and therefore all the more distinctly, shows the mind of the Edwardian Church and the customary use of the Office which we have reason to call the standard of English liturgical arrangements; and hence is a very sufficient warrant (if warrant be needed) for the practice, now again returning into use, of keeping separate those Services which are radically distinct, and have no inherent connexion with each other. (2) The words "*partakers* of the Holy Communion," taken in conjunction with the manner in which other rubrics are framed, clearly but undesignedly point to a twofold division of the congregation—those who receive, on any given occasion, and those who worship without communicating. This division, happily, is once more becoming acknowledged both in our public Services, and in our books of private devotion. But, it need hardly be said, that both classes, in the eye of the Church, are either actual "communicants," who receive with regularity, though with greater or less frequency, or persons under preparation for Holy Communion. The idea which has obtained credence, partly from the somewhat questionable phrase, "non-communicating attendance," which it would be wise to supersede by a more strictly orthodox term, but more widely from the misrepresentation of enemies, that the Catholic party desire the presence of those who are positively *non*-communicants, in the strict meaning of the words, and not even future recipients under preparation, at the highest Mysteries of the Church, cannot be too earnestly disavowed. Such a desire would be equally opposed to the practice of antiquity, as the opposite wish may be proved to be—to wit, to confine the wor-

shippers at a Celebration to the actual recipients at the Service in question. But this argument anticipates the next point to be considered[4].

4. The third rubric of 1549, which follows the Offertory, is of great importance. It is as follows:—"Then so many as shall be partakers of the Holy Communion shall tarry still in the choir, or in some convenient place nigh the choir, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other, that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion, shall depart out of the choir, except the minister and clerks." This rubric, so very plain, if we will but place ourselves in the position of those who framed it, has been strangely distorted. The presence throughout the holy Eucharist of those who are misnamed "non-communicants" is one of the points out of many which has been taken for granted in this Essay, for lack of space to prove. But I am not precluded thereby from incidentally offering unlooked-for evidence of my assumption[5], which is this, that the rule which guided English Churchmen, in their attendance at Holy Communion, up to the date of the issue of the First Book of Edward VI., guided them after the date of its issue on all points whereon no fresh legislation was enacted. No one, I believe, has yet been bold enough to assert that the modern custom of the nineteenth century, by which a large proportion of a congregation, on Sundays and Holy-days, deliberately leaves the church in the middle of public worship, has any ancient authority. Those who first used the new form of Liturgy in 1549, used it as far as possible, and that

[4] The case of children before Confirmation, and their presence at the Holy Communion, which, under proper supervision, is much to be encouraged, stands on a somewhat different footing. A passage which clearly shows the mind of the Church of the Edwardian and of our own age on this question, which I have not seen noticed, and which a friend has pointed out, occurs in the closing exhortation to the sponsors in the Baptismal Office. The Church therein bids Godfathers and Godmothers to "call upon them (their God-children) to hear sermons." Now, as the only public teaching which the Church recognizes in Divine worship finds its place in the Office for Holy Communion, and as those who "hear sermons" in the Eucharistic Office are not dismissed by the Church before the final Blessing, the inference is not difficult to draw, that the attendance of "non-communicating" children, in the strict sense of the words, is provided for of the Church of England.

[5] On this question consult *Tracts on Catholic Unity*, No. 7; *The Presence of Non-Communicants*, &c., by the late Dr. Mill (Darling, 1852); *The Anglican Authority for the Presence of Non-Communicants*, &c. (from the *Ecclesiologist*), by Mr. Perry (Masters, 1858); *The Presence of the Whole Congregation*, &c., by Mr. J. E. Vaux (Palmer, 1861); *Communion in the Prayers the Right of Communicants*, by Mr. J. C. Chambers (Palmer, 1864); and *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (ch. xiii.), by Archdeacon Wilberforce (Mozley, 1853).

was a great deal farther than we give them credit for using it, as they had worshipped under the old form, and as their fathers had worshipped before them. And it is not too much to say, that as the people in 1549 were wont to use their Office, so at least did their children after them, so far as the changes forced upon them permitted. The exact time and manner of change from their use to our own, it is impossible to point out. It is not unlikely that the laxity, based as it is on such unwonted practice, was of gradual growth; though there is far more probability that a custom, at once so novel and so out of harmony with the spirit of the Office on which it had become parasitical, could only have arisen, or have acquired strength, in those ungodly times when a lawless Puritanism desolated the land.

The rubric quoted above is not ambiguous. As it was probable that all persons would not avail themselves of the first rubric in the Edwardian Liturgy, and "signify their names to the curate" before receiving, and as in some circumstances it might not be possible to do so, the present rubric requires, that those who receive shall locate themselves in a certain position in the church. A twofold advantage was thus secured. First, the celebrant could more easily calculate the probable number of communicants, and thus prepare a proportionate supply of the Elements; and, secondly, at the time of reception, the inconveniences which arise from an indiscriminate mixture of recipients with "non-communicants," and the unorderly and crowded approach to the Altar, which in some large churches at the present day is so painful to witness, or to suffer from, are avoided. The division of the sexes, also, is another element on the side of decency and order; and the arrangement that the men are first to approach the Sanctuary, and the women afterwards, is a matter of detail which requires no rubric to enforce, and which commends itself to the consideration of most congregations.

The words "in the choir, or in some convenient place," apparently refer to the respective cases of cathedrals, or churches with large chancels, and of parish churches, or those of which the choir contained only the "clerks and ministers." "All other," the rubric enjoins, "that mind not to receive the said Holy Communion, shall depart out of the choir" into the body of the church, "except the ministers and clerks"—an exception which, unless it were obligatory for the *clerks* to receive at each several Celebration, of which there is not the shadow of evidence, proves the rule assumed. I will only add that it is here, by implication, distinctly assumed that certain worshippers, not necessarily on each occasion recipients, were to remain "in choir" during the

Celebration—*i. e.*, "the (singing) clerks;" and, by positive direction, that "all other" who do not receive "shall depart," not out of the church, but into the nave. The custom which not only disregards the ancient English Use with respect to the congregation, but which also sets it at nought in the case of the choir, by dismissing in mid-service both choir men and boys, cannot be too severely reprobated. It is not only un-Catholic but illegal.

5. The evidence from the rubrics in support of the position taken for granted, that the Church of England does not and never did intend to "discourage and disallow" the presence of "non-communicants" is not at all exhausted. It is only possible, however, in this place briefly to point out further evidence upon a question which is becoming, almost daily, of greater practical importance in the wide field of ritual revival. (1.) The rubric preceding the Invitation, in the Book of 1549, is thus expressed:—"Here the priest shall turn him toward *those that come* to the Holy Communion, and shall say—'You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins.'" With this rubric, our own is in substantial agreement, although, if any thing, it is rather more emphatic; for instead of "*those that come,*" it uses this form of expression, "them that come *to receive*" the Holy Communion. (2.) The rubric before the Confession is to the same effect in both Books. That of the Edwardian Office runs thus:—"Then shall this general confession be made, *in the name of all those that are minded to receive* the Holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the ministers [the Epistoler or Gospeller] or by the priest [the Celebrant] himself." What may be the use to which the words *either by one of them* refers is doubtful, and does not enter into this discussion; though the exact force of the words, and how they were practically carried out, deserves attention. (3.) The rubric before the Prayer of Humble Access is almost identical in both Books. In that of 1549 it gives this direction:—"Then shall the priest . . . . say in the name *of all them that shall receive* the Communion."

Now, I am fairly entitled to ask, what may be the meaning of this threefold, and apparently marked, repetition of a single idea in the words, *those that come to receive, those that are minded to receive,* and *them that shall receive* the Holy Communion, if the meaning which they bear upon their fore-front be questioned? Up to a certain point in both the Offices the Congregation has systematically been spoken of, in general terms, as *the people.* That this point is relatively different in the respective Liturgies does not affect the argument. Prior to the Invitatory, the faith-

ful have been referred to, or directed, collectively as *the people*, or in equivalent terms. But now there is a decided change in the form of address. In 1549, as we have seen, a local division had taken place in the Congregation; in 1662, if this visible division had ceased, the Church still contemplated a theoretical one. In both cases, in the mind of the Church, there were present those who were about to communicate, and those who worshipped without communicating. The Church, therefore, now more especially addresses those who approached the Altar. It is no longer the people, but those that come to, those that are minded to, and them that shall *receive*. Can rubrical directions be more explicit? I trow not. But if any one be still doubtful of the intention of the Church on this matter, as expressed in these rubrics, I would beg of him to turn to those directions which govern similar prayers in other Offices of the English Prayer Book. The difference in language is at once apparent. For instance:—In the Order for Morning Prayer, before the Confession, the words following are ordered "to be said of *the whole congregation* . . . *all* kneeling." Before the first LORD'S Prayer, the rubric directs the minister to kneel, "*the people* also kneeling, and repeating it with him." Before the first *Gloria*, the rubric runs as follows:—"Here *all* standing up, &c." After the Creed the rubric has these words—"*all* devoutly kneeling." And this difference is brought out all the more strongly in the respective Books, although in opposite ways, (*a*) in the rubric which precedes the Thanksgiving after the Communion of the faithful in the Book of 1662, as if the Church would once more unite the congregation in a common act of Divine worship in the Prayer of their common LORD:—"Then shall the priest say the LORD'S Prayer, *the people* repeating after him every petition;" and (*b*) in the rubric of 1549, after singing the Post-Communion, which is still more emphatic:—"Then shall the priest give thanks to GOD in the name of all them that have communicated, *turning him first to the people*, and saying—'The LORD be with you.'" Whilst, of course, as the Church cannot send away the congregation unblessed, she pronounces over *the people*, all and severally, the concluding Peace of GOD and Blessing of GOD.

6. On the frequency of Celebrations, the rubrics of Edward's Book are valuable. This Essay undertakes, on certain points, to contrast as well as to compare, the two Liturgies of 1549 and 1662; and it would, therefore, be dishonest not to mention, however humiliating may be the avowal, that with which it is impossible not to be struck in reading their respective rubrics—the marked difference, I mean, in tone on the question of the fre-

quency of administering the Blessed Sacrament which these Books display. It must be owned with sorrow, that in this matter the standard of the Church of Charles II. fell very far below that of Edward VI. A daily Celebration in cathedral and other churches is explicitly legislated for in the Book of 1549; and a Sunday and Holy-day Communion is supposed to be the *minimum* of spiritual privileges granted by the pastor to his flock in the ordinary parishes of England in the sixteenth century. The first point is clear from the following rubric:—"In cathedral churches, or other places where there is daily Communion, it shall be sufficient to read this Exhortation (*Dearly beloved in the Lord*) once in a month." That the second statement is not less justifiable is evident from the words which precede the Appeal to the Negligent, which rule that; "If upon the Sunday or Holy-day the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the priest earnestly exhort his parishioners to dispose themselves more diligently, &c."

Now compare these directions, which certainly were not overburdensome to the clergy of that day, with the following orders from our own Prayer Book, and the tepidity and laxness of the later rubrics of the Church of England, on this question, become painfully evident:—"When there is a Communion," says the rubric which commands the Oblation of the Elements—as if such an event was not the weekly right of every parish and of all congregations. "When the minister giveth warning for the Celebration, which he shall alway do upon the Sunday or some Holy-day immediately preceding," says the rubric after the Prayer for CHRIST'S Church—as if a Sunday Service, and the Blessed Sacrament, in a Catholic sense of the former, were separable. Whilst worse than either case are the words of the first of the rubrics at the end of the Office for Holy Communion, which runs thus:—"Upon the Sundays and other Holy-days, if there be no Communion," &c.; thus giving a distinct sanction to a degenerate and indefensible abuse of eliminating the central part of the chief Office of the Church, and of declining to offer to the people the LORD'S own Bread of Life on the LORD'S own Day. This custom had never before been intermitted on the Festivals of the Church, as all, even the opponents of a daily Celebration, are forced to own, from the first ages—aye, and from the first days of the Christian Faith. And although the practice of using a portion only of the Eucharistic Office has been once known in a single Church (and the singularity of the use disposes of its authority) for a limited period on certain days, and although the practice was sanctioned, and limited to use on Wednesdays and

Fridays by the First Book of Edward; it was reserved for its Puritan revisers in the Second Book to continue the downward course from the Wednesday and Friday to Holy-days; and, strange as it may sound, to the Catholic restorers of the Book of 1662, to complete the declension by extending the mischievous license from other Holy-days to Sundays. This is a matter which deserves more consideration than can here be given to it; and I will only add, as a counterpoise on the other side, that the Church's innate Catholicity has proved too strong for either revisers or restorers, for she still possesses rubrics and ritual variations for a *daily* Celebration, as well as for a weekly and Holy-day Communion, not only at the greater Festivals, but throughout the whole course of the Christian year [6].

III. Lastly, we will consider some of the features in the Liturgy of 1549 which are wanting in that of 1662, and *vice versâ*.

1. At the conclusion of the Collect for Purity, there followed in the Edwardian Liturgy a feature, which of all elements of

[6] Since this Essay was written, Archdeacon Freeman has published his pamphlet, *Rites and Ritual*. It is with concern that I find myself on several points in the text at issue with so learned an author. Still, in reliance upon authorities not less learned and far more numerous, I venture to adhere to what I have written; and I am fortified in my decision by considering that amongst Churchmen the Archdeacon (with one or two exceptions which add but little to the weighty authority of his own judgment) stands well-nigh alone. For Archdeacon Freeman's persuasive and solid arguments in favour of a weekly celebration, the Church of to-day is his debtor. It is only to be regretted that he should have stopped so far short of the truth which is admitted to be plainly Scriptural, and which is generally allowed to be universal from the times of the Apostles, as to substitute, argumentatively, a weekly for a daily Celebration. A revival of weekly Communion would be, of course, a very great advance upon the degenerate custom of the present day. But we must never cease in our efforts until the "Daily Sacrifice" be restored to the Church of England. And it is a matter for much regret that one who is so deeply learned should be carried away by what must be called his prejudices, and permit himself not only to advocate the lower course when the higher is within his grasp, but suffer himself to speak lightly of those who follow the once primitive and now Catholic custom, as well as disrespectfully of what flows, or is supposed to flow, from their position.

Archdeacon Freeman almost contemptuously dismisses the important question of a daily Celebration, and the necessary corollary to it, which is implied in the words "non-communicating attendance," by saying that "a *faint endeavour* has been made to disprove" his singular theory that the Holy Eucharist is "a Sacrifice of that class or kind in which *partaking* [i.e. a reception by *each* worshipper at *every* Celebration] (is) an essential and indispensable feature" (p. 41). "The English Church (he contends) has given no more [and, it may be added, has given no less] countenance than the

secondary importance, is of the highest possible beauty—the Introit. For its use, we have to refer to two rubrics which, when harmonized, direct that, "then shall the priest, or the clerks, sing in English for the Office, or Introit, as they call it, a Psalm appointed for that day." The term Office in this rubric is a technical one, and must not be confused with the term which is indicative of the form which the public worship of Almighty GOD may assume. It is the translation of the old English term *Officium*, the *Introitus* of other parts of the Western Church. The position of the Introit in this place will be considered to be unusual. But it is strictly in conformity with the ancient Sarum Use; and if we will accept the first LORD'S Prayer and Collect for Purity, as they were intended to be used, as semi-private and wholly introductory prayers, the position of the Introit ceases to be anomalous. It then becomes the special introduction to the Liturgy, variable, as we shall perceive, both for the day and for the season.

The Introit, as we are accustomed to hear it, not only is used in a position relatively incorrect, but its form has undergone great modification and change. I think I may venture to assert, under the authority of one of the first of living ritualists, that in its earlier form the Introit was a complete Psalm, in harmony with the Mystery or Event commemorated. In its later form, the Psalm as a whole was abandoned; its place was supplied by a fraction of it. Eventually, the *Officium* assumed the outline which we see that it possesses in the Sarum Use; and it now

Church of old to this practice. Contenting herself, at first, at the Reformation, with forbidding non-communicants to remain in the choir [on which assertion I venture to refer the reader to the text], she afterwards so effectually discouraged and disallowed their presence at all [though in what manner the Archdeacon fails to specify], that it became unmeaning to retain the prohibition any longer." (*Ibid*). Upon which I will only further remark, that until some proof (as distinct from opinion, and still more from assumption), is adduced, that the Church contemplates the exodus of nine-tenths of an ordinary congregation on "Sacrament Sundays"—(1) in the middle of Divine service; (2) at no assigned point in the Office; (3) without any rubrical hint or suggestion to this effect, still less any direction; and (4) with no form of blessing (and justly so) being provided for those who deliberately and Sunday after Sunday turn their backs upon the Lord's Table—until proofs on these four points be provided, I think that the laxity of the practice may be fairly charged on the clergy who sanction and the congregations which avail themselves of, rather than on the Church, which is simply and helplessly patient under, this modern and unauthorized innovation; and that those who are striving to restore a stricter and more consistent, as well as more Catholic, system of worship deserve a more respectful mention (at least at the hands of Archdeacon Freeman) than of merely making a "faint endeavour."

consists of one or more specially selected verses of Holy Scripture, generally taken from the Book of Psalms, with a *Gloria Patri*, and a single or twofold repetition of its first portion. I have no wish to depreciate the value and beauty of the selections and arrangements of the later forms of Introit. The chords which they strike, and the line of thought which they suggest, are of the chiefest importance; and of course, having been sanctioned and employed by the ancient English Office, they come to us with authority. But, for simplicity at once and grandeur, and yet more for practical devotional usefulness at the present day, the still earlier form of Introit, the variable and special Psalm in its entirety, must commend itself to most minds: whilst the objection to its adoption, which intrinsically has great weight, that the great Sarum Use knew not of it, can be more than met and answered by the existence of an even earlier form from which, probably, S. Osmund himself compiled his venerable Office.

This feature of Edward's First Book is one which it is within our power to restore to the Church of to-day, not perhaps in its liturgical position after the Collect for Purity, but before the introductory LORD'S Prayer. The Introit, indeed, thus loses its peculiar beauty, as a burst of praise between the solemn and subdued introduction, and the plaintive and penitential *Kyries:* but it will have its own value and its own characteristics even as an Invitatory to the Holy Eucharist. And the devotional effect of singing the 98th Psalm at Christmas-tide, the 96th at the Epiphany, the 16th on Easter Day, and the 47th during the octave of Ascension; or again, the 6th Psalm on Ash Wednesday, and the 32nd and the 130th on the first two Sundays in Lent, the 22nd on Good Friday, and the 88th on Easter Eve can hardly be overstated. In truth, if the Church of England is to restore to its proper dignity and honour the highest Service that she is permitted to offer to Almighty GOD, and if she is to provide for her children an Office around which the minor Services may revolve, that central Office must contain within itself the elements of each kind of liturgically devotional worship. And the Psalter—our LORD'S own Prayer Book, as it has been fitly called—should not be excluded from taking its proper part in the celebration of the chiefest Mysteries.

2. The singing of the Introit was followed by the threefold *Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison,* a feature we still possess in the responsive prayers after each of the Ten Commandments. "Then the Priest standing at GOD'S Board shall begin" the *Gloria in Excelsis.* In King Edward's Book, the intonation which is now generally restored, and to which reference is made

by-and-by, is clearly marked—"Glory be to GOD on High. *The Clerks.* And on earth peace, goodwill towards men." Beyond the position which this Hymn assumes in our present Office (which has been spoken of before), there is nothing which calls for notice except the different divisions of it from those with which we are familiar, and the repetition of the clause, "Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us"—a reiteration, to whatever cause it may be assigned, which undoubtedly enhances the dignity and increases the devotion of the earlier form of the *Gloria in Excelsis.*

The variations in the divisions of the Hymn need only a passing notice: and as a question of criticism, perhaps the new paragraph in the early part which begins, "We praise Thee" in the Edwardian edition, and the re-division of the last two sections in the edition of 1662, are respectively improvements in the earlier and later forms. But on the repetition of the clause, "Thou that takest away," &c., it is exceedingly difficult, from the lack of evidence, to form any opinion. The question has often been placed before liturgical students, with no approach to solution: but, short of absolute proof, the rationale of the matter, which seems to meet most of the requirements of the case, has been suggested to me by one whose acquaintance with ancient Liturgies is profound. The explanation is a simple one. It is thought that the iteration of the clause arose solely from accident. The repetition first appears in the revised Prayer Book of 1552. Between that date and the year of the appearance of the first Book, 1549, the plain song arrangement of Marbeck had given place in some Cathedrals to certain musical Offices which had been harmonized. In the execution of one of these harmonized *Glorias,* the clause in question was repeated, possibly by the trebles, whilst the tenor voices kept to the air. Of course, as the words were to be sung for the use of the Cathedral choir, so were they printed; and it is not beyond the bounds of probability, that in the preparation, or the printing, of the Second Book of Edward a Cathedral edition of the Liturgy might have been employed as what printers term "copy" from which to print; and thus a reiteration to produce a musical effect has been perpetuated in the text of a rhythmical prose hymn, even when it is intended to be said, not sung. Whether or not this be the true cause of the addition to the *Gloria in Excelsis* cannot be decided. We can only rejoice that, either by accident or by design, so effective and striking an addition has been made to this all-but inspired hymn of Eucharistic adoration—for, in its present position, no less has it become.

3. Between the announcement of the Gospel and its delivery, the Edwardian rubric required the clerks and people to make answer—"Glory be to Thee, O LORD." This *Gloria*, though verbally removed from our printed Liturgy, has lingered on in many parishes, from the vitality of unwritten tradition, and has, at length, been very generally restored to our public services. It is somewhat strange that the Response—"Praise be to Thee, O CHRIST," may be looked for in vain in the Book of 1549, since such is the customary response in the Western Church. There appears to be no reasonable doubt, that the form which has of late years obtained amongst ourselves, and that somewhat widely, of saying or singing after the Holy Gospel, the thanksgiving—"Thanks be to Thee, O GOD," is founded on a mistake. These words are ordered to be said in the present Latin Rite, immediately after the Epistle. Thence they have been clearly removed, by common consent with us, to the close of the Holy Gospel. But this is an error. And we cannot too quickly restore the ancient Western custom of adding the unwritten Response—"Praise be to Thee, O CHRIST," to the traditional use, which the Liturgy of Edward once authorized, of singing before the Holy Gospel the Versicle—"Glory be to Thee, O LORD."

4. In the Office of 1549 the Nicene Creed is now reached. "After the Gospel ended (says the Edwardian rubric), the priest (*i. e.*, the officiant priest or Celebrant, as distinguished from the minister or Epistoler, and the deacon or Gospeller) shall begin—"I believe in One GOD." These words were said by the priest alone, and the clerks and people were ordered to "sing the rest." This method of singing or saying all prayers, or forms of devotion, in which the people join with or follow the priest, as has been said, is only retained traditionally with ourselves. Its use has many claims upon those who aim at reverence in public worship. For not only does this method reach us on authority, and hence must be the correct use, but it must approve itself to the devotional taste and requirements of the worshipper. Let any one compare these two methods, and I venture to say he will decide in favour of the first. In the one case, the priest sounds the note, as it were, in the Confession, "Almighty GOD," in the LORD'S Prayer, "Our FATHER," in the Creed, "I believe in One GOD," and in the Angelic Hymn, "Glory be to GOD on high." The people are thus prepared, and placed on the *qui vive* to join with solemnity, devotion, heartiness, or worship, as the case may be, in the penitential words of the *Confiteor*, the universal petitions of the *Pater Noster*, the faith-forming clauses of the *Credo*, or the soul-stirring strains of the *Gloria in Excelsis*.

These several portions of Divine service are then sung or said with energy and life, and are uttered with an unanimity which bespeaks one heart and one mind. But how different is the other method. It is very possible that the end of the prayer is said in unison; it is not at all unlikely that the mid-prayer gained, people and pastor may be at one. But prior to these periods, there ensues a distressing effort, either on the part of the people to overtake their leader, or on the part of the priest to keep the lead he has secured, or on the part of both to keep pace with each other. The result is an unedifying gabble, and as different from the uniformity and "swing" of the older system, as harmony is different from discord.

At the end of the second division of the Creed, the Edwardian Book presents a curious omission which the Caroline Liturgy supplies. The clause, "Whose Kingdom shall have no end," is omitted. The omission must, one would think, have been purely unintentional. For the words, it need hardly be said, appeared in their equivalents in the old English Use; and they were replaced in their wonted position in the Second Book of Edward VI., A. D. 1552. Another omission, which admits of no such easy explanation, is likewise evident in this English form of the Belief—an omission which, it is much to be regretted, has not been supplied in any later revisions of the Liturgy. It occurs in the last division of the Nicene Creed. The old English formula, in the description of CHRIST'S Church which claimed the belief of Christian men, ascribed four essential qualities or "notes" to the Spouse of CHRIST. These were her attributes—Unity, Sanctity, Universality, Apostolicity: in other words she was termed, in the Sarum Rite, "*Unam, Sanctam, Catholicam, et Apostolicam Ecclesiam.*" The note "Holy" has been left out; but wherefore, it is simply impossible even to conjecture. Moreover, by the modern method of printing and punctuation[7], we have a fair chance, popularly, to lose sight of a second note of the Church, her essential, and though at present invisible, yet most certain Unity. For our Prayer Books, by omitting a comma after the

[7] This is one point out of many in which the printing of our Prayer Books might be improved. In these days of elaborate typographical arrangement and careful printing, it is unreasonable that the Prayer Book of the Church and the Holy Bible should be the last to be influenced by these improvements. The energies of our Societies and of the privileged presses have been directed almost exclusively to the production of correct and cheap copies of both Books. Perhaps, now this result has been attained, we may hope for a more ornamental and varied system of printing. Should these words meet the eye of any person with authority over the presses in question, they may lead him to entertain or to reconsider this proposition.

title "One," and by printing the term without a capital letter, have given to the adjective the appearance of a numeral; and the unwary reader is led to suppose that this Article of the Creed is directed against those who hold that there are two or more Catholic Churches—a position which, in itself however true in some aspects, falls very far short of the intention of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Fathers.

5. The Oblation in King Edward's Book begins, as with ourselves, with the Offertory Sentences; and the selection of the Sentences from Holy Scripture in both Liturgies is identical. There are slight variations in the rubrics of the two Offices which, as they bear upon present custom, it may be well to notice. The Liturgy of 1662 directs "one or more of the Sentences" to be said at the discretion of the priest. This discretionary power, one would think, is of sufficient authority to warrant the saying of one Sentence only. Why I claim this privilege will appear later in the argument. Meanwhile, the directions of the Edwardian Office sanction two distinct methods of using these Antiphons, or Anthems as the case may be. The rubric lays down that "one or more of these Sentences" shall "be sung while the people do offer," and permits the alternative "or else one of them" shall "be said by the minister immediately afore the Offering." A supplementary rubric of 1549, with the purport of which a second rubric of our own agrees, further adds, that "where there be clerks, they shall sing one or many of the Sentences, according to the length and shortness of time that the people be offering." These rubrics are not difficult to harmonize. In the mind of the Church two ways of celebrating holy Mysteries presented themselves, a plain Service and a high Celebration. At the former, the priest was directed to say one of the Sentences, by way of Antiphon: at the latter, one or more were "to be sung whiles the people do offer," and this after the manner of an Anthem. Surely in this case, we may again seek for an Edwardian interpretation for a Caroline rubric, and exercise our discretion as to the saying or singing of one or more of the Offertory Sentences, independent of the length or "shortness of the time that the people be offering."

And this gives me an opportunity to say what I desire to urge on the consideration of those who are responsible for the conduct of Divine Service. The privilege which I claim is important on this ground. If we are at liberty to say but one of the Sentences for the Offertory (which, by the way, should be said as an antiphon, i. e. facing East, and not as an exhortation, i. e. facing West), we may certainly avail ourselves of the licence accorded on all

sides for the introduction of Hymns to re-introduce the ancient Sequence of the English Church. Of course such an introduction, at such a time, is not strictly in accordance with ancient Anglican use. But it would seem to be far wiser to secure the principle whilst it is within our reach, than to wait to obtain the accident which may never be granted to us. The principle, it appears to me, consists in this, the singing of some Eucharistic Hymn in the Office for Holy Communion (variable with the day and season) to correspond with the Sequence of old, in addition to those which the Office already contains. This is of the first importance. It is of far less moment at what precise period of the Liturgy such a Hymn be sung. It would be undoubtedly better to follow ancient precedent, and to sing the Sequence after the Epistle; but as our Office is constituted, there seems to be a not un-rubrical opening for such congregational singing where I venture to suggest. The close of the Sermon at a high Celebration, where the Office, by an exercise of private opinion in opposition to ritual precedent, is not shortened by its omission, presents a favourable opportunity for additional exercise of this kind. The Sermon is not always in absolute harmony with the Office. And even if it be not discordant, the effect of meditative, dogmatic, or jubilant Hymns, as the case may be, on the very subject of the Liturgy, cannot fail to be productive of benefit to the mind of the worshipper. Moreover, the Collection of the Alms, needful as it is, and devotional as it may be made, tends to distraction rather than the reverse. And in such a case, the singing of an Eucharistic Hymn is a custom much to be encouraged. The custom, I am glad to say, is widely gaining ground; and as attention has of late years been directed to this division of Hymnology, there are many Eucharistic Hymns, both from modern and ancient sources, which may be made available for Liturgical Use.

6. Another rubric, as supplementing the one which we now possess, may here be noticed, and for clearness' sake, may be repeated at length. "Then shall the minister (it saith) take so much Bread and Wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion, laying the Bread upon the corporal, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose. And putting the Wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use, if the chalice will not serve, putting thereto a little clean and pure Water. And setting both the Bread and Wine upon the Altar, then the priest shall say—*Dominus Vobiscum.*" Our present rubric is more concise than that of 1549, but not at all

at issue with it. Several explanations may be given for its non-restoration at the last revision. A dislike of multiplying rubrical directions where not absolutely needful, may have been one reason; and when the Use of a church is carefully carried out, there is much force in the hesitation to add over many rubrics to her public Offices. The absence of a specific rubric, again, may be caused by its needlessness. If the custom indicated in the preparation and position of the paten and chalice were carried on up to, or had been restored by the year 1662, there was little need for the reimposition of the rubric. It may be said that there is no evidence against this latter supposition. Private opinion may vary on its merits; but until positive proof is brought forward against the customary following of the rubric in question, I shall venture to assert, that at this point in the Office the ceremonial above directed still holds good in the Church of England, by the inherent vitality of traditional custom and the force of uncondemned rubrical authority. First, it is the duty of the celebrant, or his assistant, then to set "both the Bread and Wine upon the Altar, laying the Bread upon the corporal or in the paten, or in some other comely thing," which few will be prepared to deny; and also, which it is much to be feared many are not disposed to accept, "putting the Wine into a chalice," and adding "thereto a little pure and clean Water." This I hold to be the traditional custom of the English Church, which has never been legislated against, and which has the sanction of the deliberate judgment of the Church, as expressed in the rubrics of the first English Liturgy. Into the question of the mystical symbolism of the Mixed Chalice, which is not at all hard to discover, of its world-wide and continuous use from the first Celebration to the present hour, and of its institution by the Divine Founder of the Eucharist, I have not opportunity to enter. Suffice it to say, that a few generations (and this, literally, is all that can be urged) of intermitted use by a certain portion of a national Church, cannot be allowed to weigh in comparison with a custom which is Catholic from the date of its use by the LORD Himself, or stand in the way of a revival which has now a fair chance of again becoming general in the Church of England. (Consult Dr. Littledale's *Letter to the Bishop of Exeter* on *The Mixed Chalice*. 2nd Ed., 1865. Palmer.)

7. In the Liturgy of 1549, the second *Dominus Vobiscum* followed the Offertory. The Versicle and Response was apparently used, as a sort of connecting link between the necessarily mundane element in the Collection of the alms, and the less terrestrial Prefaces which follow. This portion of the Office is perhaps one

of the weakest features in the First Book of Edward, not in comparison with that which sprang from it, our own Liturgy, but in comparison with that from which it sprang, namely, the ancient Sarum Use. In this estimate the Proper Prefaces are included: but I will only enter into explanation so far as to say, that whereas the old English Office contained Proper Prefaces for Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity, and for the Festivals of the Apostles and the Blessed Virgin, nine in all, the Edwardian Book, in common with that of Charles II., possesses only five. We are thus deprived of four beautiful and edifying variations in the Eucharistic Service, not only at the two entire seasons of Lent and Epiphany, but extending over the whole course of the Ecclesiastical year, as the Feasts of the Saints and of the Virgin Mother come round.

Nor is this all. For, if any one will carefully analyze the language of our Daily Preface, the early part of which is identical with that of King Edward's Book, he will have his suspicions aroused that the sequence of the devotional ideas is not absolutely perfect. Something, it will strike him, is required to justify the deduction, "Therefore." In the Proper Preface the conclusion is obvious. In the Daily Preface it is obscure. A glance at the Sarum Use will confirm the suspicion and suggest the explanation. From thence we see the course followed by those who edited the Edwardian Liturgy. They appear to have taken the conclusion of the *Proper* Preface, where, after the recitation commemorative of the Mystery or Event, the use of the preposition was legitimate, and to have made it serve as a termination to the *Daily* Preface, where there is no such recitation—a service which it performs only indifferently well. The original portion of the Daily Preface, of which the present termination formed a sort of amplified repetition, has been lost to the Church—at least for a season—and this is the more to be regretted, as the early English form contained an ascription of mediation, through Whom alone the Sacrifice is acceptable—"Through CHRIST our LORD."

One other point may be noticed in the Edwardian Preface. The *Sanctus*, of course, at once follows and concludes the Preface. In the Book of 1549 we find the *Sanctus* expanded, before the last clause, by the addition of the words—"Hosannah in the Highest; Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the LORD;" and then follow the words—"Glory be to Thee, O LORD, in the Highest." This part of our heritage we have ritually lost, though we may retrieve it ceremonially. I mean, these words may be, and are, once more sung amongst us, as an antiphon, immediately before the Act of Consecration. They then fall

under the classification of Hymns; and in the use and manner of Hymns there appears to be a general licence, of which we, as well as others, may fairly avail ourselves. If sung at all, they will of course be sung kneeling; and the appropriateness of the Antiphon in this place is self-evident. That these words do form a portion of our inheritance, a reference to the older Offices will prove. But they have been somewhat misplaced in the Liturgy of 1549. The ancient Church was wont to add dignity to the Proper Prefaces, on special Festivals, not only by interweaving the teaching of the day into her service, but also by lengthening the *Sanctus* which concluded the Preface with the words of the Children of Jerusalem. On ferial days she restrained her devout jubilation, and her daily *Sanctus* agrees with our own. So that, whilst on the Feasts we lose the grand roll of the ancient *Sanctus* in its developed form, yet, on ordinary days, we adhere more closely to the severer form which was employed by our forefathers, from at least the age of S. Augustine of Canterbury.

8. Closely connected with this Antiphon before the Consecration is an Anthem, which was formerly used after that Act, "in the Communion time," as the rubric of 1549 orders. This connexion is not only intimate with reference to the subtraction of the form of the words at the revision of the First Book of Edward, in 1552, but with respect to its virtual restoration in the present day, under the sheltering wing of the authority of Hymns. This Anthem is the *Agnus Dei*, and may once again be heard at high Celebrations, softly chaunted by the choir kneeling, as the faithful approach to receive the sacred Body and Blood of their LORD. The restoration of the Anthem, both in the spirit and of the words of the earliest Liturgy in the English language, is at once loyal and devout; and will doubtless, gradually but generally, commend itself to many amongst us. The actual words of the *Agnus Dei* are enshrined in our present Litany; the latter form of it being said first, and repeated once, the earlier being said last, without repetition.

9. A few other points can be noticed only in brief. (1) The respective titles of the two Offices, which may be seen at full length at the head of the table, page 516, are worthy of remark. The Edwardian Church was neither afraid nor ashamed to use the old English word "Mass" as a suitable, convenient, and in those days familiar term for the Blessed Sacrament. There appears to be little reason (apart from prejudice) why we should not again make use of the same word—where it may be employed without misapprehension and a breach of charity. The use of the conjunction *and* in 1549, and of the disjunctive *or* in 1662,

before the words "Holy Communion," is apparently intended to mark some theological distinction; though, if there be any difference, their precise value in the respective cases it is hard to discover. (2) The first LORD'S Prayer is not printed in the Book of Edward. It is directed to be said by "the priest standing humbly *afore the midst* [the reader will not fail to observe the position of the Priest at the Altar indicated by the italicised words] of the Altar," together with the Collect for Purity following. This is one further proof from the Liturgy of 1549, over and above many that can be found in that of 1662, that the "Amen" at the conclusion of this LORD'S Prayer is to be said by the Priest alone, and not by the people. The latter use, to be heard in some churches, is attributable to a misapprehension of the rationale of the Prayer in this position, and to a forgetfulness of later rubrics, and the implied direction which is contained in the type (the roman letter) in which the "Amen" is printed in our present Book. (3) The Edwardian rubric which allows the Exhortation, "Dearly Beloved in the LORD," to be read "once in a month," and to be omitted if in the Sermon "the people be exhorted to the worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament," is a sufficient liturgical warrant for its omission on week days now, as well as for its less frequent use at high Celebrations on Sundays. (4) In the Liturgy of 1549 (as is well known) the Words for the Administration of the Blessed Sacrament are confined to the first clause of our present form of words. There can be no doubt that the retention of the latter clause was the result of compromise. As a question of expediency it was, perhaps, politic to retain both. The use of the shorter form more nearly represents the earlier and primitive mode of reception: but there is nothing in the second clause, when added to the first, to which exception can justly be taken. For the Communion of the Priest, the Edwardian Words only, with a change of person, is of course the proper form to use. And in cases of necessity—e. g. in which a larger number of persons have to be communicated by a single priest, than is possible in a given time—the shorter form alone might advantageously be employed for the reception of the people. Probably few Bishops would object to this return to a more early custom, if the congregation desired the same. (5) It has been often urged that the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in the Caroline Office is only forbidden by a rubric:—"If any remain of That which was consecrated . . . the priest . . . shall, *immediately after* the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." There is much reason for thinking that this rubric was not intended to forbid Reservation on behalf of the Sick. Into the general

question of Reservation of the Holy Communion I will not here enter. But for the purpose of private reception, and to avoid consecration elsewhere than in Church (the custom of private celebrations in houses being unknown in the early ages) it is much to be wished that this rubric might be interpreted by the Edwardian Prayer Book. In cases of widespread sickness we have the highest ecclesiastical authority for the licence to place a liberal construction on the Caroline rubric. And those who minister amongst the lowest poor in Missionary work, even apart from "the time of pestilence," can bear witness, how distressing oftentimes are celebrations in the crowded and sick rooms of a town population. They would welcome a modification of the present rubric, which indeed only requires Episcopal consent to interpret in conformity with the provisions of the Liturgy of 1549; and under present circumstances no Bishop, it is believed, would refuse to allow a mere rubrical relaxation which would save the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament from much irreverence to which it is now (by no immediate fault of those to whom it is administered) almost necessarily exposed[8].

Little need be said in conclusion. Though the comparison and contrast between the two Liturgies has occupied much space, it is still imperfect. Some points have been omitted; some have been treated with brevity. But I rejoice to have been able to bring forward the claims which the First Liturgy of Edward VI. possesses upon English Churchmen. These claims are well known; but, perhaps, not so widely as they deserve to be. And it is in the hope of attracting to them further attention that this Essay has been written. That all the positions herein assumed are impregnable, I will not assert; let them be fairly and impartially criticised: but of the importance of the subject, as a Question of the Day, I am convinced. The Church party emphatically deprecate, under existing circumstances, any change whatever in the Prayer Book. But, in the event of revision being determined upon by authority which they can alone acknowledge, they are prepared to advance towards that standard to which each succes-

[8] Priests in London are specially interested in such relaxation. A case was lately told me, in which the Holy Communion had to be administered in a sick chamber to a dying man, who occupied but one corner of the room. The other corners were tenanted. In one of them was crouched, throughout the administration, an unfortunate woman of known bad character: and during the Celebration unclean insects were, literally, to be seen crawling over the "fair white linen cloth!" This is one instance amongst many of recent occurrence which might be quoted.

sive restoration has approximated; and I have it in my power to say, that a large body of Churchmen (both lay and clerical), including all the foremost leaders of the Catholic school (and amongst them, I will add, the revered and beloved Teacher so lately taken from amongst us was one), in the event of a revision being forced upon the Church, would demand a restoration in conformity with the First Book of Edward VI. On such a question, by such petitioners, what is thus demanded must be entertained, and will, in all likelihood, be conceded. At all events, it will prove to all whom it may concern, that if any change be proposed in our Offices, there are at the least two ways in which alterations may be carried out; and that a Catholic restoration, under the present existing circumstances, to say the least, is not more improbable than a Protestant revision of the Book of Common Prayer.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

THE END.

GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS, ST. JOHN'S SQUARE, LONDON.

00111597

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016